Report of the

TASK FORCE ON STUDENT SOCIAL LIFE

Middlebury College

November, 1989

MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE
MIDDLEBURY, VERMONT 05753
(802) 388-3711

Dean of the College

3 November 1989

TO: President Olin Robison
Board of Trustees

COPIES TO: Reaccreditation Team

FROM:

Patrick Aylmer '90
Peter Chenevert
Albert Coffrin
John DeMatte '90
Fran Fontes '92
Ann Craig Hanson
Frank Kelley
Bethany Ladimer
Margaret Lynch '89
Patricia Palmer
W. Kyle Prescott
Steven Rockefeller
Pamela Small
Gail Smith
John Spencer
Ali Wilson '91
Richard Wolfson

SUBJECT: Submission of Report

The Task Force on Student Social Life is pleased to submit its final report. We believe that the assessment, data and recommendations provided in this report and its many appendices will be useful to the College over the next several years. We are at a unique time in our history. As we approach the 21st Century, we have an opportunity to shape and strengthen the quality of student life on this campus. The recommendations offered within provide the framework for enhancing and building a better social life for students.

The Task Force would like to acknowledge the input and contributions of dozens of members from the community who assisted the Task Force. Those who offered testimony are cited within the context of the report. Additionally, many members of the College assisted in the preparation of the report including James Terhune, Lynne Ellis '91 Mark Miller '92, Karl Lindholm, Anne Hoover, Cindy Wright Myrick, Karen Keeler, Betsy Etchells and Betty Hamilton. We are grateful for their assistance.

In the course of our work we have been reminded of the deep commitment the College has made to develop a positive student life. We applaud the efforts currently being made on campus by students, staff and faculty to enhance student life. We offer these recommendations in the spirit of making greater gains.

ACH:blh

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I

Goals of The Study 1

Chapter II

Student Social Life and Areas of Study 5

Chapter III

Data Collection and Main Findings 11

Chapter IV

Recommendations and Rationales 39

Appendices 55

A 56

B 58

C 70

D 79

E 84

F 89

G 93

H 102

Chapter I

GOALS OF THE STUDY

In January of 1989, President Robison appointed five task forces to study areas of special concern which had been selected in connection with the College's self-study for reaccreditation. The Task Force on Student Social Life was to be chaired by Judge Albert Coffrin, '41, a former Trustee and Overseer of the College, but due to health problems Judge Coffrin was not able to assume this responsibility. Ann Craig Hanson, the Dean of the College (1989-1990), was appointed chair in his absence.

The Task Force members are:

Patrick Aylmer '90

Peter Chenevert, Director of Campus Security

Judge Albert Coffrin, Overseer

John DeMatte '90

Francesca Fontes '92

Ann Craig Hanson, Dean of the College (1989-1990)

Frank Kelley, Director of Residential Life

Bethany Ladimer, Associate Professor of French

Margaret Lynch '89

Patricia Palmer, Trustee

W. Kyle Prescott, Trustee

Steven Rockefeller, Professor of Religion

Pamela Small, Assistant Professor of Biology

Gail Smith, Assistant Director of Athletics, Coach of Men's and Women's Tennis

John Spencer, Professor of History

Curtis Viebranz, President of Alumni Association (appointed to the Task Force 2/3/89; resigned August 1, due to transfer to England).

Ali Wilson '91

Richard Wolfson, Professor of Physics

The charge from President Robison to the Task Force on Student Social Life was to "assess the degree to which student social life and behavior may have changed in the ten years since the

issuance of the 'Coffrin Committee' report, and in the course of this study, to take a particularly close look at the role played by fraternities."

In response to President Robison's charge, the full Committee divided into four sub-committees:

1) The Student Sub-Committee, convened by Frank Kelley

2) The Staff Sub-Committee, convened by John Spencer

3) The Trustee, Overseer, Alumni and Parent Sub-Committee, Pat Palmer and Kyle Prescott, Joint Conveners

4) The Faculty Sub-Committee (the work of this Sub-Committee was handled by the full Task Force).

The Sub-Committees met as the need arose during the ensuing six months.

The full Task Force met thirteen times between January and October to collect, discuss and review information.

The Task Force collected information in a variety of ways. It identified groups from whom it wished to hear testimony, collected documents and reports, and visited other campuses. Groups and individuals from whom it collected information are listed below: (Individuals are named and the title of each presentation is identified.)

1. Administrative Staff:

A. John Emerson, Dean of the College, "Perspectives on the Fraternity Issue and Behavior" (4/11/89)

B. Karl Lindholm, Dean of Students: "Changes in Student Social Life in the Past Ten Years" (3/9/89) & "Problems with Student Social Life" (4/11/89)

C. Gary Margolis, Director of Counseling and Human Relations, "Changes in Student Social Life: A Mental Health Perspective" (3/9/89)

D. Jim Terhune, Assistant Director of Student Activities, Cathy Walsh, Director of Student Activities: "Social Life, Party Registration Procedures" (4/11/89)

2. Faculty:

The faculty had made their position clear with regard to the fraternity issue through debate and vote, and the plan for additional faculty input was discussed and approved at a full Task Force meeting. A mailing was sent to all faculty members inviting them to submit written statements of opinion (see Appendix A). Also, an open meeting of the Task Force was scheduled

and all members of the faculty were invited to attend. Members of the Faculty Council and the Educational Council, specifically, were invited to attend this meeting. Four members of the Educational Council, three members of the Faculty Council and three members of the faculty-at-large participated. Six faculty members submitted written comments.

Finally, while the majority of the faculty is opposed to maintaining the fraternity system in its present form, the Task Force did solicit testimony from one faculty member who favors maintaining the fraternity system.

A. Michael Claudon, Professor, Economics: "Why Fraternities Should be a Part of Middlebury College" (5/11/89)

3) Students

The Task Force solicited student input by surveying students and hearing testimony from students. A survey, consisting of questions from a student survey given ten years ago, as well as questions designed by the Task Force was sent to a random sample of approximately 400 students. A more complete discussion of the survey and its results is given in Chapter III. (See Appendix B for a copy of the student survey, cover letter and follow-up letter).

In addition to the survey, testimony was solicited from the following students:

A. Mickey Kelley '89, President of the Inter-Fraternity Council 1988-1989 and Catherine Eels '89: "A Pro-Fraternity Perspective" (4/11/89)

B. Jennifer Duncan '91, Rachel Freeman '89, David Graham '89, Susan Palmer '89; "An Anti-Fraternity Perspective" (4/11/89)

C. Jim Boyle '90 (President, D.U.), Charles Gaffney '89 (non-fraternity member), Vicki Hoyt '89, Laura Rude '90 (current member of K.D.R.), Larry Sullivan '90 (Vice President of Sig Ep); "A Pro-Fraternity Perspective" (5/11/89)

The Task Force also received and reviewed 169 unsolicited letters from students.

4) Alumni, Parents, Trustees and Overseers:

In order to systematically collect information from alumni, parents, Trustees and Overseers, a random sample of 2,000 current parents and alumni was conducted. All Overseers and Trustees were also surveyed, making the total number surveyed 2,075. The Alumni Survey is presented in Appendix C.

The Task Force solicited testimony from one alumnus:

1. John Myhre '78, community resident, former President Chi Psi (5/11/89) "Presentation to the Task Force."

Finally, the Task Force received and reviewed 24 unsolicited letters from parents and alumni which discussed these issues. These letters were either sent directly to the Task Force, the Alumni Magazine, or to President Robison.

5) Campus Visits and Speakers from Other Colleges

The Task Force sent teams of Task Force members to visit the following institutions:

Amherst College
Bowdoin College
Carleton College
Colby College
Oberlin College
Williams College

Two members also collected information while visiting the Pomona College and Wesleyan University campuses.

We invited deans from other colleges to attend a round table discussion about student social life. They were:

Kenneth Lewallen, Dean of Students, Bowdoin College
Janice Seitzinger, Dean of Students, Colby College
Edward Shanahan, Dean of the College, Dartmouth College
David Winer, Dean of Students, Trinity College

Seven Task Force members observed campus social life from 12:00 a.m. until 3:00 a.m. on either a Friday or Saturday night.

Finally, Task Force members read and reviewed a variety of written statements and documents submitted to it. (See Appendix D for a complete listing of articles, documents, studies, etc. provided to the Task Force.)

The rest of this report will be organized as follows:

Chapter II - Student Social Life and Areas of Study

Chapter III - Data Collection and Main Findings

Chapter IV - Recommendations and Rationale

CHAPTER II

STUDENT SOCIAL LIFE AND AREAS OF STUDY

The Task Force on Student Social Life examined current patterns of student life outside the classroom. It has focused on a few areas which have been identified as needing attention.

It is important to mention at the outset, that the Task Force recognizes and applauds the attempts of many on the Middlebury College campus to enhance the quality of student life. Creative programs such as the Undergraduate (the non-alcoholic pub), Earthfest, May Day, the Gamut Room, Volunteer Services, the Hunger Clean Up Day, the BSU (AAA) Fashion Show, Winter Carnival, Black Cow Cafe, and the Environmental Quality Black-Out Dance have made important contributions to student life.

The student life programs, policies and procedures in place at the College are generally well designed and well administered. Students benefit from a good social life on campus. However, in recent years there have been changes that have adversely affected the dynamics of student social life, and some new policies and arrangements are necessary.

The single most important factor affecting student social life in the past ten years, has been the change in the legal drinking age from 18 to 21, which occurred in July, 1986. The change in the drinking age has not resulted in less drinking, but rather it has contributed to intensified drinking and increased abusive drinking. It has also increased tensions between students and administrators who are responsible for upholding new alcohol regulations.

For 15 years student social life had been centered downtown. However, the night life for students in downtown Middlebury has all but disappeared. While students do gather on occasion downtown, they usually do so in small groups to drink and eat at bars. Several drinking, eating and dancing establishments have closed as a result of the new drink age laws. Social life in the form of "partying" or socializing with alcohol has moved back to campus, and particularly to the fraternities.

The offerings of non-party social life on the Middlebury College campus are plentiful. There is a rich variety of films, concerts, lectures, dance recitals, and other evening programming. These events are often well attended by the College and town community. We applaud the efforts of the Student Activities Office and other organizations which are responsible for providing this programming.

These offerings include a large number of events which contribute significantly to the intellectual life of students outside the

classroom. However, many of these events are not well-attended by students and there is concern that the intellectual quality of student social life could and should be improved. The Task Force, therefore, decided to include in its sphere of study the intellectual quality of social life.

Fraternities are especially attractive party places for students because they are perceived by students to be "off-campus" and independent of College administrative control. The Middlebury College Activities Board (MCAB) sponsors at least one party or event a week, but these parties are often not well-attended. The fraternity parties are seen as the hub of social life. (For a history of the fraternity system, see Appendix E.)

Evidence of the expanded party activities at the fraternities is shown below:

Registered Fraternity Parties

1985-1986	20 parties	(approximately)
1986-1987	40 parties	
1987-1988	103 parties	
1988-1989	240 parties	(with no DU parties)

It should be noted that these numbers also reflect greater adherence to the party registration policy. Thursday night fraternity meetings (because alcohol is served) are also now registered.

Fraternity membership has increased in recent years. The perception that alcohol is readily available at the fraternities at a time when the legal drinking age is 21 has been, in the opinion of some, a primary reason for this increase. Additionally, the use of fraternities as party spaces has increased.

Fraternity Membership

Year	Number of Fraternities	Male Students Enrolled	% Male Student Population who are Fraternity Members	Drinking Age
Early 1960's	10	750	90%	21
1968	6	900	figure unavailable	18
1985	5	950	25%	18
1989	6	1,000	30%	21

In addition to increased attendance at fraternity parties, there has been an apparent increase in the amount of private drinking in the residence halls. The practice of "pre-loading" or, having a few quick drinks in one's room and then going to parties, has

become more and more prevalent, especially among underage drinkers who are unable to get alcohol at College-sponsored parties.

Because of the limited amount of student social space in some of the older residence halls, it is difficult for students to socialize in their living units. They often, therefore, socialize at College-sponsored parties or fraternities. Fraternity parties attract large numbers of students and behavior often becomes rowdy. Large parties also make it easier for students to become "anonymous" and to behave in ways that are unacceptable without being held accountable for their actions.

While the fraternities have made an effort to enforce state policy with regard to the drinking age (by checking I.D.'s and stamping hands of legal drinkers at the door, as well as by monitoring drinking inside), the numbers of party attendees, the quantity of beer available, the lack of commitment to preventing underage drinking by most students, and the ingenuity of many underage drinkers has accounted for a breakdown of checking systems inside the fraternities. On the other hand, College-sponsored parties, catered under the College's liquor license, are strictly monitored, and often times student workers or College employees patrol dances confiscating beer from underage drinkers.

Security reports show that, on average, five hospital runs are made each weekend night in response to alcohol-related injuries and illnesses. Several incidents have been extremely serious. Numbers of this magnitude were unheard of a few years ago and reflect only those who call for help.

The College has not remained idle while this has happened. Prior to the change in the law several new alcohol education programs were developed and the Counseling Service was expanded. Also, a Winter Term course in Alcohol and Alcohol Abuse has been offered the past two years (in which overflow numbers of students have participated). Efforts to inform and educate students about alcohol have been creative, widespread and comprehensive. Even so, it appears that many of our underage students choose to ignore the law. Additionally, it is reported that some students frequently drink simply to get drunk.

Since the change in the drinking age, alcohol consumption in the dormitories and the fraternities has led to an increase of abusive and violent behavior resulting in increased vandalism and damage. Most incidents of vandalism are alcohol-related and perpetuated by male students.

Listed below are the charges billed for residence hall and fraternity damage. The reader should be aware that these figures represent the total charges billed by Buildings and Grounds which may be adjusted after the billing. All billing costs, fines and charges have increased significantly in the past few years.

a. What role do fraternities play in the College community?

b. What opportunities do they provide for their members?

c. Is the charge that fraternities are a divisive element on the campus true?

4. Intellectual Life Outside the Classroom

Social interaction between students and faculty members has had a positive effect on student development. Are there ways in which Middlebury College could enhance and promote greater contact between faculty and students?

a. In the dining halls?

b. In the residence halls?

CHAPTER III

DATA COLLECTION AND MAIN FINDINGS

The Task Force conducted two surveys in order to collect systematically: a) student opinion and, b) alumni, parent, Trustee and Overseer opinion.

1. Student Survey

The Subcommittee for Student Input decided to conduct a survey of students on campus. A questionnaire was developed using many of the same questions which were used in the survey for the reaccreditation study ten years ago.

The questionnaire was reviewed by two members of the faculty (who have considerable expertise in survey research). Each made suggestions for improvement, many of which were incorporated. The survey was discussed and approved by the entire Task Force.

Because many of the charges levelled against the fraternities are concerned with issues of elitism, racism, exclusivity, anti-intellectualism and because of the relatively small number of minority students on campus, it was decided to over-represent minorities and international students in the group of respondents. A random sample of 50% of all international and minority students on campus were surveyed. A random sample of 300 of all other students were also surveyed. Approximately five days after the original survey was distributed, a follow-up postcard was sent reminding all selected students to return their surveys. Ten days after the original survey was distributed, all non-respondents were mailed another letter requesting their participation and a second survey was sent. All respondents were assigned a number for follow-up purposes only. Anonymity was guaranteed to all participants. Of the 376 surveys which were distributed, 287 were returned for a response rate of 76%.

Frequencies and crosstabulations were calculated and are described below. The reader should be cautioned, however, that because both minorities and international students are over-represented in the sample, distributions reflect this bias.

The general format of the student survey asked students their opinions about a variety of issues. Specifically, students were asked to strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, or indicate they had no opinion on a variety of questions. The total percentages described below and in the tables do not always equal 100 percent. It was decided to include in these descriptions the numbers of students who chose not to answer the question in the cumulative percentages. Therefore, percentages that do not equal 100 percent include non-respondents.

Demographic Characteristics of Sample

As indicated in Table 1, respondents were approximately equally divided between males and females. Juniors composed only 14% of the respondents, while roughly a third of the respondents were freshmen and a third were sophomores. Of those students who responded, 86% are United States citizens, 93% live on campus and 14% are fraternity members. Finally, 79% are White, six percent are Black/African American, four percent are Hispanic, nine percent Asian and three percent are members of another race or ethnic group.

General Experience

It is clear from the results of this survey that students highly value several aspects of Middlebury College. As seen in Table 2, the highest percentages of students report they highly value the academics (97% of the students agree or strongly agree), the natural environment (95%), the faculty (94%), and a few close friends (92%). Lower percentages of students report they highly value the social aspects of the town (34%) and the fraternities (53%).

When asked about their overall experience, 81% of the respondents strongly agree or agree that they are satisfied with their overall experience at the college, but slightly more than a quarter of the students are satisfied with the college's social programs. Thirty-one percent of the students report that they found the social life boring.

A series of questions focused on assessing a student's sense of belonging or feeling comfortable in the community. While 91% of the students agree or strongly agree that they found a group of friends on the campus who made them feel at home, 29% indicate that they agree or strongly agree with the statement that they often feel lost or lonely, and 22% indicate that they feel they do not belong at Middlebury (see Table 2). Half of the respondents agree that the Middlebury campus offers a sense of community. Only 34% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that students who do not have a lot of money feel welcome on the campus. Finally, half of the respondents agree or strongly agree that social relations among students from diverse backgrounds are good.

Almost half of the students have a strong sense of identity with their class and half believe they know many students in all four classes.

Students were also questioned about observing racism, a racist action, sexism or a sexist action. Table 3 indicates more students report observing a racist action in the residence halls (20%), somewhere else on campus (16%) or in town (16%) than at the fraternities (8%). This finding, then, contradicts the viewpoint that suggests fraternities at Middlebury encourage racism.

Table 1
Distributions of Demographic Characteristics (N=287)

Characteristic	Percentages
Sex	
Male	47.9
Female	52.1
Class	
'89	24.1
'90	13.5
'91	31.6
'92	30.9
other	0.0
Race/ Ethnicity	
White	79.1
Black/African American	5.7
Hispanic	3.9
Asian	8.5
other	2.5
Citizenship	
United States	85.5
Canada	1.4
Europe	1.8
Africa	1.1
Middle East	0.0
Asia	6.3
Other	2.5
Current Residence	
Dormitory	92.9
Fraternity	2.5
Off-campus	3.9
Fraternity Membership	
Non-members	83.3
Members	14.2

Table 2
Student Opinions of Selected General Experiences
at Middlebury in Percentages (N=287)

Activities/ Experiences	Student Opinion: Strongly Agree/ Agree	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
I value highly:			
Academics	97.2	0.0	.4
Faculty	93.6	3.9	1.4
Athletics	68.8	16.0	14.5
Social aspects of the town	34.4	51.8	12.8
Natural environment	95.1	2.5	2.1
Social experience	71.3	24.5	3.2
A few close friends	91.8	5.3	2.1
Fraternities	52.5	36.5	9.6
College organizations	68.1	15.3	16.0
College organized events	78.1	13.1	7.1
Facilities	81.9	12.4	4.6
I am very satisfied with my overall experience at Middlebury College	80.5	15.2	1.4
I am very satisfied with social life at the College	47.5	47.2	2.1
I am very satisfied with social programs offered at the College	27.6	63.1	7.1
I seldom feel lost or lonely	66.3	28.7	3.9
I have found friends who make me feel at home	90.8	7.5	1.4
I feel I belong here	73.0	21.7	2.5
There is a real sense of community on this campus	50.7	44.7	3.2
I have a strong sense of identity with my class	47.5	47.9	3.5

Table 2 continued

Activities/ Experiences	Student Opinion: Strongly Agree/ Agree	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
I know lots of students in all four classes	54.3	41.9	2.8
Middlebury students are considerate of the rights of others	52.9	35.8	7.1
Night-time social life at Middlebury is a bore	30.9	60.3	3.5
On this campus:			
Students without a lot of money feel comfortable	34.1	50.0	12.4
International students feel welcome	58.9	17.7	18.8
Students are tolerant of differences	23.0	67.1	7.8
Students are tolerant of differences in race and ethnicity	66.3	25.5	5.3
Students are tolerant of religious differences	81.9	9.2	7.8
Social relations among students from diverse backgrounds are very good	47.9	43.3	7.1

Table 3
Observations of Students in Percentages
(N=287)

Observations	Percentages
Students who report they have observed:	
Racism/a racist action	
in the residence halls	19.9
in the fraternities	7.8
another location on campus	16.0
in the town or its environs	15.6
Sexism/a sexist action	
in the residence halls	43.6
in the fraternities	38.3
another location on campus	34.8
in the town or its environs	18.8

On the other hand, students indicate that they have seen sexism or a sexist action in the residence halls (44%) or at fraternities (38%) more frequently than they indicate they have observed these behaviors at another location on campus (35%) or in the town (19%).

Finally, students were asked to estimate the number of weekly hours they spent on a variety of activities (See Table 4). Half of the students report spending seven or more hours each week in informal socializing (including conversations, television or movies) and 14% spend seven or more hours per week socializing in fraternities. Thirty-eight percent of the respondents report that they do not socialize at all in fraternities.

Alcohol Use

Students were also questioned about their opinions pertaining to alcohol and their own use of alcohol. As Table 5 indicates, sixty percent of the respondents agree or strongly agree that alcohol abuse is a serious problem on our campus. There is considerable agreement that students are aware of our alcohol policy (76%) and likewise only eight percent of the students believe that other students uphold the policy.

Seventy-one percent of the students believe that the new Student Center Pub should serve alcohol, and almost half of the students believe that the College should not do more to enforce the alcohol and drug policies.

As illustrated in Table 6, when questioned about their own drinking behaviors, most students report that they drink at parties (81%), in residence halls (74%), and at fraternities (65%). The vast majority of students report they are light drinkers (33%) or moderate drinkers (43%), and 15% report they do not drink.

Interestingly, when students were asked to describe the average number of beers, glasses of wine or mixed drinks they consume on a night they drink, 15% said they have more than 6 drinks, 17% have 5-6 drinks, and 29% drink 3-4 drinks. Finally, slightly over half of the students report they drink either one or two times per week.

Drinking behaviors are further described in Tables 7 and 8. As Table 7 indicates the highest percentages of male students rate themselves as moderate drinkers (52%). When examining drinking patterns by fraternity memberships, we can see (Table 8) that most non-fraternity members rate themselves as light (38%) or moderate drinkers (41%) while most fraternity members rate themselves as moderate drinkers (62%). Twenty-four percent of fraternity member respondents consider themselves heavy drinkers.

Intellectual Atmosphere

Table 9 indicates that 78% of the student respondents agree or strongly agree that they find the intellectual atmosphere at

Table 4
Hours Per Week Spent in Various Activities (N=287)

Activity	Hours Spent				
	None	1-3	4-6	7-9	10 or more
Hobbies	11.0	46.1	20.2	6.4	9.2
Athletics	12.1	27.0	22.0	11.0	24.1
Job	42.9	7.1	14.9	16.3	12.8
Attending class or lab	.4	0.0	3.9	11.7	83.0
Studying, doing homework	0.0	2.1	7.4	15.2	74.1
Socializing at:					
a fraternity	38.3	26.6	17.7	9.9	3.9
bars - in town	55.7	29.8	10.3	.7	0.0
- out of town	65.6	21.6	4.3	1.8	1.4
informally	3.9	19.1	25.9	21.3	28.7
College organizations	41.1	41.8	7.4	3.2	.7
College organized events	11.3	67.0	14.9	1.8	.4
Outdoor recreation	41.1	41.8	7.4	3.2	.7

Table 5
Student Opinions of Alcohol Use and Abuse

	Student Opinion				
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
On this campus:					
Alcohol abuse is a serious problem	22.3	37.9	33.0	2.5	2.8
Students know the policy	16.3	59.2	18.8	2.1	3.5
Students uphold the policy	.7	7.1	47.9	37.6	4.6
College should do more to promote responsible drinking	17.0	39.0	28.0	3.9	9.9
The college could do more to enforce the alcohol & drug policies	11.7	24.5	41.5	7.1	13.5
The new student center pub should serve alcohol	36.9	34.5	8.5	8.5	9.2

Table 6
Self Reported Drinking Behaviors

Behavior	Percentages
Places students drink:	
parties	81.2
residence halls	73.8
fraternities	64.9
downtown	56.4
MCAB events	30.9
Students describe their own drinking behavior:	
non-drinkers	15.2
light drinkers	33.0
moderate drinkers	42.6
heavy drinkers	5.3
problem drinkers	.7
Students describe the average number of drinks they have on a night they drink:	
non-drinker	15.2
1-2 beers, or glasses of wine or mixed drinks	21.6
3-4 beers, or glasses of wine or mixed drinks or mixed drinks	28.7
5-6 beers, or glasses of wine or mixed drinks or mixed drinks	16.7
more than 6 beers, or glasses of wine or mixed drinks	14.5
In an average week, I drink:	
no days	18.4
1 day	26.2
2 days	26.2
3 days	18.1
4 days	2.5
5 days	1.1
6 days	.4
7 days	.7

Table 7
Student Self-Ratings of Drinking Behavior by Sex
(N = 273)

Sex	Percentages					Total
	Non Drinker	Light Drinker	Moderate Drinker	Heavy Drinker	Problem Drinker	
Male	13.1	26.2	51.8	9.2	.8	130
Female	18.2	41.3	37.8	2.1	.7	143

*Significant at the .000 level.

Table 8
Student Self-Ratings of Drinking Behavior By Fraternity Membership
(N = 273)

Fraternity Membership	Percentages					Total
	Non Drinker	Light Drinker	Moderate Drinker	Heavy Drinker	Problem Drinker	
Non-Fraternity Member	17.5	38.4	40.6	2.6	.9	229
Fraternity Member	2.7	10.8	62.2	24.3	0.0	37

*Significant at the .000 level.

Table 9
Selected Student Opinion on Intellectual Atmosphere
(N=287)

Intellectual Atmosphere	Student Opinion: Strongly Agree/ Agree	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
I find the intellectual atmosphere at Middlebury College stimulating	78.4	18.5	1.8
My academic interests have been a major factor in determining my friends	18.4	78.7	2.1
I feel comfortable approaching faculty members outside the classroom	84.7	12.8	2.1
It would contribute to the intellectual environment on this campus if faculty had contact with students in:			
dining halls	69.9	21.3	6.4
the fraternities	17.1	68.8	11.7
the residence halls	27.0	60.6	10.6
the Undergraduate	42.9	38.0	15.2
student organizations	85.5	7.8	6.0
special interest groups	90.4	3.2	5.3
faculty homes	80.8	9.6	7.4

Middlebury College stimulating. Only 18% of the students strongly agree or agree that they use academic course work or interests as a basis for determining friendships. Eighty-five percent of the respondents feel comfortable approaching faculty outside the classroom.

Students agree or strongly agree it would contribute to the intellectual atmosphere if faculty had contact with students in special interest groups (90%), student organizations (86%), faculty homes (81%) and dining halls (70%).

Residence Halls

Students were asked a variety of questions with regard to the residential system. A few of the more pertinent findings are highlighted below and presented in Table 10.

A considerable percentage of students (75%) agree or strongly agree that all-first year student residences should be retained. Only 20% believe that residence halls should be integrated with all four classes. There is also strong student support (73% strongly agree or agree) that special interest or theme houses should be an option for students. Students agree or strongly agree (65%) that they should be allowed to have more block draws, and that more programs supportive of intellectual life (55% agree or strongly agree) should occur in residence halls.

In contrast, there are only small percentages of students who agree or strongly agree that the residences should be locked by midnight each night (11%) or that faculty should be more involved in the residence halls (23%).

Students identify several areas which they believe are problems in the residence halls: damage to college property (76%), lack of adequate social space (64%), mess in halls and bathrooms (57%), noise level (45%).

Fraternities

Several questions asked students their opinion about various aspects of fraternity life. As Table 11 indicates, 44% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that Middlebury should keep fraternities in their present form. On the other hand 35% believe Middlebury should keep fraternities but change them.

The Task Force asked students their opinions on several of the recommendations that the faculty made with regard to fraternities. Only 12 percent of the students agree or strongly agree that fraternities should stop using Greek letters, only 21% agree or strongly agree that they should drop affiliations with the nationals, and only 22% agree or strongly agree that fraternities should change their name from fraternity to a gender-free term. Support is much stronger for fraternities having full and equal participation by women (46%). Thirty-four percent of the students agree or strongly agree that sororities

Table 10
Selected Student Opinions on Issues of Residential Life in Percentages
(N=287)

Residential Characteristic	Student Opinion: Strongly Agree/ Agree	Disagree/Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
All-First year student residences should be retained	75.2	18.4	4.3
All residence halls should be integrated with all four classes	19.9	77.0	2.1
Students should be allowed to have more block draws	64.5	15.6	18.4
Faculty should be more involved with residence halls	22.7	62.1	14.5
Special interest or theme houses should be an option for students	73.4	19.5	6.7
More programs supportive of intellectual life should occur in residence halls	55.0	27.3	16.7
Residence halls should be locked by midnight each night	10.3	84.4	4.6
The following are serious problems in the residence halls:			
lack of privacy	24.9	70.5	2.8
noise level	45.0	49.6	2.8
stealing	14.6	78.0	4.3
damage to College property	75.5	20.9	2.1
crowding	35.5	55.4	7.8
maintenance	29.4	62.8	5.3
mess in halls and bathrooms	57.1	37.2	3.5
lack of adequate social space	63.8	29.8	3.5
lack of adequate supervision	10.6	81.9	4.3

Table 11
Student Opinion on Fraternity-Related Issues

Fraternity Issue	Student Opinion		
	Strongly Agree/ Agree	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree	No Opinion
Middlebury should keep fraternities in their present form	44.0	45.7	7.8
Middlebury should keep fraternities but change them	35.1	48.2	12.4
Fraternities should stop using Greek letters	12.4	64.8	19.5
Fraternities should drop national affiliations	20.9	53.5	21.6
Fraternities should change their name from "fraternities" to a gender-free term	22.3	58.5	16.7
Fraternities should have full and equal participation by women	46.1	39.4	10.3
Coed residential units/clubs should be established on this campus	73.8	13.1	9.9
Sororities should be established	33.7	46.1	17.0
Women-only social/ residential clubs should be established	32.3	42.2	19.9
Fraternities should be abolished	20.9	68.4	7.8

should be established. Likewise, 32% believe women-only social/residential clubs should be established.

Twenty-one percent of the students agree or strongly agree that fraternities should be abolished. The highest percentages of students report that they agree or strongly agree that coed residential units/clubs should be established (74%).

Crosstabulations were used to further explore some of these issues. The results are described below.

With regard to disassociation from the national, Table 12 provides further information. As can be seen, fraternity members strongly disagree or disagree (76%) that fraternities should disassociate from the national. Comparisons on this question by class, race, gender and citizenship were not significant. With regard to the issue of Greek letters (see Table 13) more fraternity members strongly disagree with the abolishment of Greek letters than do non-fraternity members. Comparisons on the basis of race, gender, class and citizenship were not significant.

Students were questioned as to their opinions on the establishment of sororities. The results both by gender (Table 14) and by Fraternity membership (Table 15) were significant and indicate that females (22%) agree or strongly agree that sororities should be established compared to 49% of the males. More fraternity members believe they should be established (74%) than non-fraternity members (29%).

Crosstabulations were also used to assess student opinion with regard to whether fraternities should have full and equal partnership of women. The results for both gender and fraternity membership were significant. Table 16 reflects student opinion with regard to fraternities having full and equal participation of women using gender as a comparison group. Approximately equal percentages of men (47%) and women (49%) agree or strongly agree that fraternities should have full and equal participation by women. When asking the same question using fraternity membership as a comparison group, 50% of the non-fraternity members either agree or strongly agree that fraternities should have full and equal participation by women, compared to only 37% of the fraternity members (see Table 17).

Student opinion was solicited with regard to whether fraternities should be abolished. Responses were analyzed to determine opinion by fraternity membership (see Table 18). Twenty-four percent of student respondents who were not fraternity members agree or strongly agree that fraternities should be abolished, while five percent of fraternity member respondents agree. The same question was asked using gender as a comparison group. Table 19 illustrates 73% of the males who responded to the survey believe fraternities should not be abolished, and 68% of the women agree they should not be abolished.

Table 12
Student Opinion that Fraternities Should Disassociate
From their National Organizations by Fraternity Membership
(N = 266)

Fraternity Membership	Percentages: Strongly Agree/ Agree	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree	No Opinion	Total
Non-Fraternity Member	22.5	52.9	24.7	227
Fraternity Member	15.8	76.4	7.9	38

*Significant at the .004 level.

Table 13
Student Opinion That Fraternities Should Stop Using Greek Letters
By Fraternity Membership
(N = 269)

Fraternity Membership	Percentages: Strongly Agree/ Agree	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree	No Opinion	Total
Non Fraternity Member	13.6	64.8	22.7	229
Fraternity Member	7.7	87.2	2.6	39

*Significant at the .000 level.

Table 14
Student Opinion that Sororities should be Established by Sex
(N = 267)

Sex	Percentages			
	Strongly Agree/ Agree	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree	No Opinion	Total
Male	48.8	35.2	16.0	131
Female	21.8	59.1	19.0	142

*Significant at the .000 level.

Table 15
Student Opinion that Sororities Should be Established
By Fraternity Membership
(N = 267)

Membership	Percentages			
	Strongly Agree/ Agree	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree	No Opinion	Total
Non-Fraternity Member	28.9	53.5	17.5	228
Fraternity Member	73.6	10.6	15.8	38

*Significant at the .000 level.

Table 16
Student Opinion That Fraternities Should Have Full and Equal Participation of Women by Sex
(N = 270)

Sex	Percentages: Strongly Agree/ Agree	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree	No Opinion	Total
Male	47.0	45.3	7.7	130
Female	49.2	37.4	13.6	140

*Significant at the .007 level.

Table 17
Student Opinion That Fraternities Should Have Full and Equal Participation of Women By Fraternity Membership
(N = 265)

Fraternity	Percentages: Strongly Agree/ Agree	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree	No Opinion	Total
Non-Fraternity Member	50.4	38.4	11.5	226
Fraternity Member	36.8	60.5	2.6	38

*Significant at the .000 level.

Table 18
Student Opinion that Fraternities Should be Abolished
By Fraternity Membership
(N = 268)

Membership	Percentages			
	Strongly Agree/ Agree	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree	No Opinion	Total
Non-Fraternity Member	24.0	67.3	8.73	229
Fraternity Member	5.2	89.5	5.26	38

*Significant at the .000 level.

Table 19
Student Opinion That Fraternities Should be Abolished
By Sex
(N = 274)

Sex	Percentages			
	Strongly Agree/ Agree	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree	No Opinion	Total
Male	19.8	73.3	6.9	47.8
Female	23.1	67.9	9.1	52.2

*Significant at the .004 level.

Finally, as might be expected (see Table 20) 77% of the fraternity members agree that the fraternities should be maintained in their present form while only 40% of the non-fraternity members support this position.

In addition to asking questions about the changes proposed by the faculty, the Task Force also questioned students about whether, if the change occurred, they would join the fraternity, social club, or sorority. These findings are reported in Table 21. Only 13% indicate that if Middlebury kept the fraternity system without change they would join, while 42% would not. Eleven percent would join if they kept fraternities but changed them. The changes proposed by the faculty with regard to not using Greek letters, dropping national affiliation, or changing the name to a gender-free term, generated little interest in joining the fraternity if the change occurred (5%, 6% and 5%, respectively). Only seven percent indicate if sororities are established they would join. Likewise, only five percent indicate that they would join women-only social/residential clubs. Finally, the highest percentage of students report that if coed residential units were established, they would join (20%) and the smallest percentage of students indicate they would not join (23%).

The Task Force asked students a series of questions with regard to "antisocial" behavior which had been raised as criticisms against the fraternities. (Specific Tables were not made for these results. However, Appendix B has percentages reflected on the student survey). Forty-nine percent of the respondents agree or strongly agree that fraternities promote exclusivity, 41% agree or strongly agree they promote sexism and 37% agree or strongly agree that they promote homophobia. On the other hand, there was less agreement that fraternities promote racism (19%) or anti-intellectualism (29%).

The Task Force questioned students about several of the advantages and benefits of fraternity membership which had been raised in praise of fraternities. Sixty-two percent of the students agree or strongly agree that fraternities offer a positive social alternative for their members, and 82% believe they offer an opportunity for camaraderie. Students were also asked their opinion on a variety of services that fraternities provide to the college. Seventy-six percent of the respondents agree or strongly agree that fraternities provide an important service to the college through social events, through parties (76%), community service (64%), a sense of identity with their members (56%) and through involvement with the larger community (48%). All of these findings are reflected in Appendix B.

Finally, in reviewing all of this data, it is useful to examine changes in student opinion over the past ten years. Table 22 presents student opinions for respondents in 1979 and 1989. As can be seen, there is a shift in many areas and in particular in those that pertain to student social life. Of particular note, 62% of the respondents in 1979 compared to 34% of the respondents

Table 20
Student Opinion That Fraternities Should Be
Maintained In Their Present Form By Fraternity Membership
(N = 269)

Fraternity Memberships	Percentages: Strongly Agree/ Agree	Strongly Disagree/ Disagree	No Opinion	Total
Non-Fraternity Member	40.1	51.2	9.6	229
Fraternity Member	76.9	23.1	0.0	39

*Significant at the .000 level.

Table 21
Student Opinions With Regard To
Joining Fraternities/Revised Organizations

	Percentages of Students Indicating:	
	Would Join	Wouldn't Join
1. Middlebury keeps fraternities in their present form	12.8	41.5
2. Middlebury keeps fraternities but changes them	11.0	37.9
3. Fraternities stop using Greek letters	4.6	38.3
4. Fraternities drop national affiliations	6.0	36.2
5. Fraternities change their name to a gender-free term	5.3	37.9
6. Fraternities have full and equal participation by women	9.9	36.2
7. Coed residential units be established	19.9	23.0
8. Sororities be established	6.7	31.2
9. Women-only Social/Residential Clubs	5.0	29.4

Table 22
Opinion Over a Ten-Year Period With Regard to
Middlebury College Experience

	Students Who Agree or Strongly Agree	
	1979	1989
The aspects of Middlebury that I value highly are:		
academics	98	97.2
athletics	72	68.8
social aspects of town of Middlebury	62	34.4
natural environment	98	95.1
social experience	74	71.3
a few close friends	94	91.8
fraternities	42	52.5
College organizations	49	68.0
College organized events	89	78.0
I am very satisfied with my overall experience at Middlebury	93	80.5
I am very satisfied with the social life at the College	76	47.5
I seldom feel lost or lonely	60	66.3
There is a real sense of "community" on this campus	66	50.7
Middlebury students are considerate of the rights of others	64	52.9
Night-time social life at Middlebury is a bore	23	30.9
I find the intellectual atmosphere at Middlebury College stimulating	81	78.4
My academic interests and courses have been a major factor in determining my friends	16	18.4
I feel a strong sense of identity with my class	45	47.5
The following are serious problems in the residence halls:		
lack of privacy	36	24.9
noise level	56	45.0
stealing	21	14.6
damage to College property	42	75.5
crowding	39	35.5
maintenance	22	29.4
mess in halls and bathrooms	44	57.1

Table 22, continued

	1979	1989
The fraternities provide an important service to the College through:		
involvement in the larger community	60	64.2
a sense of identity with members	60	56.4
parties	84	75.6
Fraternities are not an essential element in Middlebury social life	19	31.2

in 1989 highly value the social aspects in town and the fraternity popularity has increased by roughly 10% in the ten years. College organized events have decreased in popularity, and both overall satisfaction and satisfaction with social life have decreased dramatically. Students indicate there is less of a sense of community and that students are less considerate of each sense other.

Students were given an opportunity to add comments. These are summarized in Appendix F.

Finally, in the past ten years, the perception that dorm damage is a serious problem has almost doubled, and students agree that mess in the halls and bathrooms has increased.

2. Alumni, Parent, Trustee and Overseer Survey

The Subcommittee for Alumni, Parent, Trustee and Overseer Input also decided to survey a random sample of its constituents. After some discussion, it was decided to randomly sample 2,000 parents and alumni, and to survey all Trustees and Overseers.

A survey was developed that incorporated many of the same questions asked of students, and was accompanied by a cover letter (see Appendix C). Although surveys were numbered for purposes of follow-up, anonymity was guaranteed.

The questionnaire was reviewed by two members of the faculty (with considerable expertise in survey research). Each made suggestions for improvement, many of which were incorporated. The survey was discussed and approved by the entire Task Force. 1063 surveys were returned for a response rate of 51%. Because the initial response rate was so high, it was decided not to follow-up non-respondents.

The surveys were analyzed and frequencies were tabulated. The results are described below.

The format of the Alumni, Parent, Trustee and Overseer Survey was designed to solicit opinions on a variety of issues. Respondents were asked to strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree or indicate they had no opinion on topics concerning the general experience, residential life, alcohol use, and fraternities at Middlebury College. The total percentages described below do not always equal 100 percent. It was decided to include those respondents who chose not to answer the question in the cumulative percentages. Therefore, when percentages do not round to 100%, the non-respondents are included in the distribution.

Demographic Characteristics of Sample

Respondents were equally divided between males and females. Seventy-five percent of the respondents were alumni and 24% were parents of students enrolled in the Spring of 1989. Thirty-seven percent of the respondents were fraternity members when

they were in college and 18% were sorority members. Fifty-nine percent graduated from college since 1960; 23% since 1980. Contrarily, only 32% graduated before 1960. Of the parents, 23% have children who are current fraternity members.

Clearly most respondents stay in touch with the college through the ALUMNI MAGAZINE (53%). Also, campus visits and correspondence with classmates, friends, and/or children were widely cited as sources of information about the college.

It is important to note that only 5% feel that they have a great deal of information with regard to current student social life. Twenty-five percent feel they are "pretty current", 51% have "some knowledge" and 19% believes they are out of touch.

General Experience

An overwhelming majority of respondents indicate that they highly value several aspects of Middlebury College.

The elements which the Alumni who responded to the survey value most highly are the natural environment (99%), the curriculum (97%), the friends they made (95%), and the faculty (95%). Forty-nine percent highly value their fraternity experience and 24% said the same about sororities.

The parents indicate that they highly value almost all the elements of Middlebury about which they were asked. In particular they cite the natural environment (97%), the curriculum (96%), the faculty (92%), and the facilities (92%). Additionally, 81% indicate that they highly value the social experience, and 37% say the same about fraternities.

Alcohol Use

A series of questions focused on the issues of alcohol and substance use and abuse. Forty-five percent of those surveyed said they believe that the alcohol use on the Middlebury campus is excessive, while 25% said that it is not. Fifty-nine percent believe the College could do more to promote responsible drinking and 50% think the College could do more to enforce alcohol and drug policies. Interestingly, 56% said that they agree that students know the alcohol policy, but 52% believe that students do not adhere to it. A relatively high proportion of respondents (54%) think that students should be able to purchase alcohol at a campus pub.

Intellectual Life

When asked to comment on the intellectual atmosphere at Middlebury, a vast majority (84%) find it to be stimulating. Furthermore, 82% believe that faculty members care about their students.

Many respondents believe that the intellectual environment on campus would be enhanced if there was greater faculty affiliation and contact with students on field trips (70%), in faculty homes (69%), the dining halls (57%), at The Undergraduate (55%), and student social spaces (50%).

Residence Halls

A number of questions were asked about the residence halls. Respondents were evenly split on whether or not residence halls should integrate the four classes (45% for integration, 45% against). Seventy percent believe that special interest or theme houses should be an option for students. Fifty-one percent believe there should be an option for greater faculty involvement in residence halls and 51% think that more programs should occur in residence halls. There was also a relatively even split on the question of locking residence halls late at night (37% for locking, 39% against).

Fraternities

The last section of the survey was devoted to questions relating to fraternities at Middlebury. There was an even split on whether or not Middlebury should keep fraternities in their current form (39% agree or strongly agree,.39% disagree or strongly disagree). Twenty-seven percent said Middlebury should keep fraternities but change them, however 47% disagree with that position. Only 11% agree or strongly agree that fraternities should stop using Greek letters while 53% did not. Similarly, 18% feel that fraternities should drop national affiliations while 51% do not support that suggestion, and 56% do not believe that fraternities should change their name to a gender-free term.

On the question of full and equal participation by women in fraternities, respondents were again almost evenly divided with 43% in favor and 37% against. Twenty-two percent favor abolishing fraternities while 62% are opposed.

When asked to comment on specific charges made against fraternities, respondents did not tend to agree that fraternities promote anti-intellectualism (38% as opposed to 23%), racism (41% as opposed to 19%), or homophobia (35% as opposed to 21%), but slight majorities agree that fraternities promote sexism (35% vs. 30%) and elitism (35% vs. 32%).

Sixty-one percent of the respondents believe fraternities offer a positive social alternative for their members and 87% agree or strongly agree that fraternities offer an opportunity for camaraderie.

Finally, respondents were asked to share their written comments on these issues. A summary of written comments is found in Appendix G.

CHAPTER IV

RECOMMENDATIONS AND RATIONALES

A. Fraternities

The following recommendations have the unanimous support of the Task Force.

1. Fraternities should not continue as presently constituted.

Rationale:

There are several reasons why the Task Force came to this conclusion. Foremost among them are a philosophical opposition to single sex social organizations and concern about the party reputation that Middlebury is developing and to which the fraternities contribute.

Sexism is an issue on the Middlebury campus. The Task Force has learned of many instances of sexism, sexual harassment and sexual abuse on campus, and at fraternities in particular. The College must eliminate this type of discrimination.

The six fraternities represented at Middlebury do not allow female membership in the national and do not encourage female membership in local chapters. This means that a woman who joins a fraternity at Middlebury can only be a member on the local level; she cannot share in the rights and privileges of national membership. This is not only hypocritical, but out of step with today's society and the world at large.

Another reason we unanimously support this recommendation is our concern about the physical condition of the fraternity houses. During the year and at the end of each academic year, the fraternities must be repaired and refurbished at considerable cost to the College. The present fraternity system, because it has assumed the major burden of providing campus parties, submits the fraternity houses to immense physical abuse.

In addition, we believe that some alcohol abuse and unacceptable group behavior are by-products of the current fraternity system. While alcohol is a problem throughout the campus, the multiple-keg fraternity parties provide an environment in which alcohol abuse and unacceptable behavior are more likely to occur.

Last year the Student Government Association voted in response to the faculty vote on fraternities. While there was overwhelming support for the retention of fraternities (37-4), there was also considerable support for their reform (36-6). The response to the Task Force's Student Survey echoed this strong student interest in retention and reform. Given these findings, as well as our fundamental belief that it is wrong to exclude

systematically half of the campus from a social system, we believe that fraternities should not continue as presently constituted.

2. **The College should create a coeducational residential/social system that celebrates the diversity and pluralism of the student body through inclusion rather than exclusion.**

Rationale:

Middlebury College has been coeducational since 1883. A coeducational residential/social system is not only in keeping with our history, but with today's society and with the mission of the College. Seventy-four percent of the students surveyed agree or strongly agree that coeducational residential/social units or clubs should be established.

A coeducational residential/social system, whether or not it includes a modified fraternity system, will insure that both men and women will live in what are now the fraternity houses. We believe this should result in less abuse and property damage. Such a system will also guarantee to women access to these very attractive residential and social spaces.

Another positive feature of a coeducational residential/ social system will be shared responsibility for social programs and parties. No longer will fraternity men alone bear the major burden of campus social life.

We can think of no argument to contradict the wisdom of this recommendation. It promotes equality and serves to remove several of the known inequities of the present fraternity system.

3. **The President should charge the Community Council to recommend a process for achieving the proposed social changes. This should be a process that involves wide student participation as well as faculty and staff participation, and the President should involve the Community Council extensively in the process of change.**

The mission of the Community Council is to make recommendations to the President on non-academic matters related to student life. It is chaired jointly by the Dean of the College and the Vice President of the Student Government Association. Its membership includes faculty, students and staff (including the Dean of Students). Given its mission and membership it is the appropriate body to develop a procedure of implementation. Wide student participation should be encouraged as this process goes forward and the Community Council should create an open forum where students, faculty and staff can appropriately debate the relevant issues. If properly organized and planned, the process of social change can become an important educational experience for many students.

While the Task Force is in unanimous support of the three recommendations detailed above, a divergence of opinion emerged as to the most appropriate manner by which to implement these recommendations. A majority of the members believe it is necessary and appropriate to abolish fraternities in order to create this new system. A minority believes the new system should be based on the present fraternity framework.

The Majority Task Force position is presented below. The minority report is in Appendix H.

Majority Report

4. Fraternities should be abolished by May 30, 1990.

Rationale:

The members of the Task Force represent a variety of different perspectives. During the course of our deliberations and through our visits to other schools, however, we developed a shared vision of what student life could become at Middlebury College. As we studied social life in the broader sense and also within the context of Middlebury's unique campus, a majority became convinced that a narrowly defined, fraternity dominated social life on campus is incompatible with our vision of the future.

As we approach the 21st Century, Middlebury is striving to become a more diverse community. We are committed to going beyond mere tolerance of differences to an era in which we appreciate the cultural diversity that makes America a unique and strong nation. We must, therefore, work to develop multi-cultural appreciation, understanding, and compassion. The fraternity system at Middlebury is a system which is exclusive, not inclusive. Its very structure contradicts the goals we believe should be pursued. As society has changed, the fraternities have not, and therefore, have become an anachronism.

We realize that fraternities at the College have played a useful role at various times in the history of Middlebury, but the fraternities of 1989 bear little resemblance to those which are sketched in the memories of alumni. Alumni from classes as recent as those ten years ago would recognize significant change. This fact can not be over-emphasized.

Task Force members heard two major arguments against the continued existence of fraternities: their structure permits unacceptable behavior and they promote sexist attitudes (i.e. bias against women). Both arguments have merit. While fraternity members are not responsible for all of the infractions that occur at fraternity houses, the fraternity atmosphere often leads to situations in which a combination of bad judgment, peer

pressure and alcohol abuse result in incidents of harassment and other forms of misconduct. The Task Force is well aware that the act of abolishing the fraternities by itself will not prevent behavioral problems from appearing in other campus settings. However, a new and different social system would help to alleviate these problems.

The other argument involves a social philosophy of equal rights, and it concerns the systematic exclusion of women from fraternities. Fraternities are rooted in a 19th Century tradition of male dominance. While women are currently eligible to be members of all fraternities locally, only two women have joined a fraternity and they do not live in the house. Moreover, women are not eligible to participate at the national level, and they are not eligible for any of the indirect benefits of membership, including job networks, leadership opportunities and more immediately, access to the prime social spaces on campus.

One might ask, "Why not reform the fraternity system? Why do we need to abolish fraternities?" Historically, fraternity response to mandated change has been hostile and disruptive. This is the third major re-evaluation of Middlebury's fraternities in the past 14 years, yet the "fraternity problem" remains. We are concerned that each step of an "evolutionary" process will be met with resistance and unrest, resulting in delays and ultimate failure.

Since 85% of the student body does not choose to belong to fraternities, it does not make sense to think the implementation of a coeducational residential/social system is best accomplished through modifications to a system that only serves the 15% of our students who are fraternity members and which provides only party entertainment to others.

In 1980, the Document of Understanding mandated equal male/female access to fraternities. There has been essentially no progress in the past ten years toward creating an atmosphere conducive to the establishment of a coeducational fraternity system. This is strong evidence that there is little desire or intention on the part of fraternities to include women. Beyond that, the survey which the Task Force conducted clearly indicates <u>that fraternity members themselvesuare less receptive to having women members</u> than are other students on campus. This indicates to us that mandating coeducational fraternities will be met with major resistance from the fraternity system.

Most women do not want to join fraternities. Those we interviewed who favored the abolition of fraternities gave sexism, exclusivity and anti-intellectualism as primary reasons. Those who favor the continuation of the system informed us that they like to go to the parties but do not feel they would gain anything by becoming members. It became clear in the course of our deliberations that the stereotypical image of fraternities for women, with all of its negative connotations, will not be easily dispelled.

Since three-fourths of our students favor a coeducational residential/social system, since fraternity members themselves do not favor full and equal participation by women, and since women do not want to join fraternities, we are convinced that a successful coeducational residential/social system cannot evolve from the fraternities. Therefore, the abolition of fraternities and the creation of a totally new system is in the best interest of the College.

Given that either abolishment or reform will require funding, time and resources, we strongly believe that the College resources should be allocated in a positive, building manner, rather than in policing and compliance.

Furthermore, we believe that there is something inherently wrong with mandating a coeducational system through the current fraternity structure. It places women in the position of negotiating for concessions from the fraternities, a posture which places the fraternities in control and which ensures that women will continue to be second-class citizens. The reform approach also puts the College in the untenable position of having to encourage women to join organizations called fraternities.

Although some fraternity leaders are willing to reform, we are only too aware of the cyclical nature of fraternity leadership, and the sense from administrators that each year necessitates new education, new programs and new means to ensure compliance. Among other things, fraternity liability continues to be a major concern. For all of these reasons, we are deeply committed to the belief that fraternities should be abolished and replaced by a new, coeducational residential/social system that enhances our abilities to build bridges of communication, understanding and compassion for each other.

This recommendation is supported by: Peter Chenevert, Francesca Fontes, Ann Craig Hanson, Beth Ladimer, Margaret Lynch, Pat Palmer, Steven Rockefeller, John Spencer, Pamela Small, Gail Smith, Rich Wolfson.

Abstentions: Judge Albert Coffrin

Opposed: Patrick Alymer, John DeMatte, Frank Kelley, Kyle Prescott, and Ali Wilson

The remaining recommendations are supported by the entire Task Force.

The Task Force has deliberately refrained from making specific recommendations as to the overall structure of the residential/social system which would be implemented following the abolition of the current fraternity system. However, we suggest that the committee which is appointed consider a system that has the following components:

a) a cluster/"commons" system

Rationale:

In this model, several residences are grouped into units. We believe that such a system could be developed and work successfully. Students would be assigned affiliation with a cluster of residence halls and houses in their first year. Each cluster would develop its own system of governance and priority. Each cluster would also be assigned one of the current fraternity houses for use as a social and party space to assure adequate social space to all of the clusters.

b) Dining opportunities in smaller settings.

Rationale:

The ambiance in Proctor is poor. Students are unable to eat in a leisurely atmosphere. The physical set-up is exacerbated by having large numbers of students released from class at the same time. The dining facilities are crowded and students often have to stand and wait with their trays in Proctor until they find an available seat.

The Social Dining Units (SDU's) offer a greater opportunity for leisurely dining, but many students choose not to eat on that side of campus. This year the Dining Services is offering a "fast food" menu in the SDU's with the hope of attracting some students to the SDU's and away from Proctor. The Task Force applauds this initiative.

Another manner of attracting students away from Proctor would be to allow students to use their meal cards in the Student Center. The Task Force supports this option.

Other areas of consideration should be:

c) greater faculty involvement in the residence halls

d) residence halls fully integrated by class

e) residence hall based student government

f) greater opportunities for programs in residence halls

B. Residential Life

The Task Force strongly endorses the concept of providing a wide variety of residential options for students.

5. **The standard residence hall configuration at Middlebury College should be women living in alternate rooms to men, on the same floor and with upperclass and first year students integrated as renovations permit. New students should be given the option of living in all-first year student dorms, and men and women should have the option to live in single sex corridors or residence halls.**

Rationale:

In our visits to other schools, as well as our study of their literature, we have learned of the benefits of integrating upperclass and new students in living units. Upperclass students in residence halls serve to discourage dormitory damage, rowdy behavior, noise, etc. Interestingly, it is at those schools where neither first year student dorms nor fraternities exist that both administrators and students believe there is less abuse of alcohol.

Because of the current configuration of the residence halls and the predominance of double rooms in the first year student residence halls, the integration of classes will need to be gradual and as renovations permit. As long as Battell, Allen and Stewart serve as dorms for first year students they should continue to be single sex by corridor. New student residence halls, as the room configuration and bathroom facilities permit, should be changed to accommodate the recommended standard living configuration. Because most literature indicates that double rooms are advantageous for new student orientation and adjustment, we recommend continuing to offer double rooms for new students. However, in addition to offering double rooms, those residence halls in which first year students have traditionally been housed should also offer a greater number of single rooms which are more attractive to upperclass students. This will have to be a major consideration during the renovation process.

As renovations occur, residence halls should continue to be designed with sufficient social space to meet the needs of the population of that residential hall.

In general, students who were surveyed did not support the idea of fully integrated residence halls by class. Students argue that first year student residences foster class unity and that their closest friends are often those with whom they shared the first year experience. Class unity, however, can be encouraged and developed through other means such as class deans or advisors, and class parties or social events. In addition, experience at colleges at which there are no "freshman dorms" indicates that first year residence halls are not the only way to foster lasting peer relationships. Moreover, we believe it is important to increase the number of integrated (by class)

residence halls if we are to improve the quality of student life.

While we have not calculated the number of additional rooms that would be needed to fully integrate the residences by class, we recognize that acceptance of this recommendation may result in the need for additions to the physical plant.

6. **The College should not offer special interest or theme houses other than the existing foreign language houses.**

Rationale:

We believe that special interest houses will serve to segregate our community and will work in opposition to the mission of the College. Special interest housing will not contribute to the goal of an inclusive social system.

7. **A mechanism should be developed to allow for occasional first year student dining.**

While it is not our intention to create a separate first year student dining hall, as the College moves toward a system of integrated housing, it will be important to create an opportunity for fostering class unity. By providing first year students an opportunity to eat together, first year students will be able to build class unity and develop friendships.

8. **Until such time as the Student Center "pub" opens, the Crest Room hours should be extended on an experimental basis.**

Rationale:

Student interest in evening/late night eating options have been expressed to Task Force members. It is not the intention of the Task Force to undercut the business of either the Gamut Room or the Undergraduate; however, extending the Crest Room hours will provide another option on campus for after-hours eating. It is recommended that the Crest Room hours be extended until midnight on an experimental basis.

9. **Preference should be given to seniors for block draws in some of the smaller residence halls until such time as another residential structure is established.**

Rationale:

Because some of the smaller houses, which house up to 25 students, do not lend themselves to an adequate distribution of students from all four classes, we recommend that seniors be permitted to draw in blocks for these living units. Block sizes should be determined by the Director of Residential Life.

10. **Contributions to the quality to student life by Junior Counselors', Residence Hall Advisors' and House Directors'**

should continue to be appreciated and acknowledged in appropriate ways by the College Community.

Rationale:

The role of residential staff has become increasingly difficult. Junior Counselors and House Directors are expected to serve as friends, counselors and disciplinarians for students. Residence hall living is a major part of college life. The experience of large groups of people learning to live together in a community is important. The residential staff needs to be supported by the College community and most especially by students. Student residential staff need to follow mandated procedures which require the reporting of students who break rules. Respect, assistance and cooperation need to be extended to residential staff and become an integral part of residential life on this campus.

C. Student Activities and Organizations
New Student Orientation

11. **All first year students should be required to participate fully in Orientation.**

Rationale:

The Task Force supports required full participation in Orientation by all first year students. Orientation is perhaps the only opportunity for students, unfettered by other obligations, to experience the broad diversity of the class and to develop class unity and loyalty to the College. Orientation is an essential part of new students' introduction to the College both socially and academically, and, therefore, participation should be required for all first year students.

The Task Force is aware of the uniqueness of certain sports and thus their inability to adhere to this philosophy. The argument has been made that certain NESCAC rules produce obstacles to full participation in orientation by some student athletes. Therefore, we urge the President to take a leadership role in proposing rule changes to the other NESCAC Presidents to bring the rules more in line with the spirit of the conference.

Peer Support Groups

12. **Peer support organizations for students with substance abuse problems and victims of sexual assault should receive added support from the College. Specialized training programs in these areas should continue to be developed so that peer counselors know how to identify and address student needs. Such training programs should be a required part of the Orientation for all student residential staff.**

Rationale:

Peer support groups are being increasingly used on college campuses across the country and are widely recognized as important resources for students facing personal crises. We applaud the existing peer counseling program at the College and urge its strengthening.

The Task Force recognizes the importance of extensive and specialized training for such groups. We urge the College to institute training programs for peer support groups in the areas mentioned above. These groups should be under the auspices of the Counseling and Human Resources Center, and our counseling staff should be actively involved in their development and growth.

Residence Based Student Government

13. The College system of student governance should be reviewed. We propose that student government be residence based and that all residence halls have their own governing unit. We believe this would provide a more effective system of representative government, improve communication, and provide additional leadership opportunities for students.

Rationale:

A frequent complaint voiced to the Task Force was that students do not have a voice or a chance for input in decisions affecting their lives. Lack of communication was cited as a problem for students. Because student government is presently based in academic departments, it is very difficult for representatives to communicate with their constituencies about issues, policies and decisions. Therefore, we recommend to the Student Government Association that they reorganize their structure to become a residence-based system, which will make communication much easier.

This proposed new system would provide additional leadership opportunities for students by providing for each residence hall to have its own governing unit and send representatives to the S.G.A. Additionally, each dormitory should be financially capable of supporting its own programs.

14. The Student Activities Office should develop and institute leadership training programs for students.

Rationale:

Middlebury College has many good student leaders on campus. However, we could do more to enhance their leadership skills and potential through programs which teach them how to conduct meetings, manage budgets, listen and communicate with others. These programs could be offered to student government leaders as well as heads of clubs and organizations. We recognize that the Student Activities Office is starting leadership programs this

Fall. We applaud this effort and hope it will be continued and strengthened.

15. Ongoing strong support should be provided as needed for African-American and Hispanic-American students in their pursuit of academic excellence and a rewarding social experience at the College.

Rationale:

The Task Force endorses the recent creation of the position of Director of Academic Support. The Task Force recognizes that the College has made significant efforts to enhance the quality of life for all students and, in particular, for minority students. We anticipate that the recent appointment of the Director of Academic Support will further these goals. We also believe that it is very important for the College to promote educational programs that heighten the awareness of, and sensitivity to minority issues.

16. The College should give strong support to clubs and organizations which enhance the intellectual quality of extra-curricular life on campus, as for example, a forensic society.

Rationale:

There has been keen student interest in debate over the past decade, but the College has not succeeded in finding a paid coach and advisor. The forensic society contributes significantly to the vitality of intellectual life on the campus outside the classroom, and its activities could be expanded and more students could be directly involved. Other clubs or organizations with an academic or intellectual focus should also be given special encouragement.

D. Alcohol and Substance Abuse

The Task Force recognizes that several committees have studied the use and abuse of alcohol on campus. Given those studies, it has not been the intention of this Task Force to replicate earlier studies. However, alcohol continues to be a problem on the campus, and we offer several suggestions for addressing the issues.

17. Student party regulations should apply equally to all parties on College owned property.

Rationale:

Some current policies governing parties held in College buildings differ from those that govern fraternity parties. Most notable among these differences is the so-called "keg rule." (If fraternities are abolished this will no longer be a problem).

18. Kegs should not be allowed anywhere on College-owned property from Sunday through Thursday.

Rationale:

Consistent with our mission, academic activities should be encouraged during week nights. Under ordinary circumstances, kegs should only be allowed on College property on Fridays and Saturdays. Exceptions may be granted only by the Student Activities office in consultation with the Dean of Students.

19. The College should encourage student organizations and individual students to sponsor parties, and should reduce the offering of student parties under the College liquor license except on occasions such as the Winter Carnival Ball.

Rationale:

The Task Force believes that student hosts should be responsible and, therefore, liable for legal violations at any party given on College property. The majority of parties at Middlebury should be private parties hosted by students who are responsible for upholding the law.

College funds (both for Activities Fees and MCAB) should continue to be used to pay for entertainment and bands, but individuals must be responsible for providing money to purchase alcohol.

20. The formation of an alcohol-free residence should be explored.

Rationale:

Consideration should be given to reserving one of the block draw choices for those who might wish to live in an alcohol-free residence. This type of residence might attract both those with and those without alcohol problems alike.

E. Student Center

21. Adequate funding should be made available for programs and staffing in the new Student Center. Beer and wine should be available in the snack bar.

Rationale:

If the Student Center is to become an important focus of student social life, it will have to be responsive to student interests. Efforts should be made to determine what activities will indeed draw the students to the Center and funds should be available. Innovative non-alcoholic events should be expanded. Parties with alcohol should be permitted with student hosts. The Center hours should reflect student needs.

The Task Force suggests that beer and wine be served in the snack bar. Since this service will be under the College liquor license, the laws of Vermont must be strictly enforced. We see

no reason to restrict those of age from purchasing beer and wine on campus since they are able to do so in any commercial establishment. Responsible drinking in a college atmosphere could set the pattern for other campus locations.

F. Student Conduct

22. Reconstitution of the Student Judicial Council should be considered. The committee should include students, faculty and staff, and be chaired by the Dean of Students. A reconstituted Council should have a majority of student members.

Rationale:

When unacceptable behavior occurs, students need to be dealt with in a consistent fair manner. We have heard criticisms that discipline enforcement is not consistent. Because we currently have a system in which students can elect to be heard by the Deans or by the Student Judicial Council, there at times occur troubling inconsistencies in the way issues are handled.

By reconstituting the Student Judicial Council as proposed sound past precedents would be followed and fairer treatment could be achieved. We recommend that the Community Council undertake the process of reconstitution and make appropriate recommendations to the President. In addition, we recommend that in extremely sensitive cases, such as those of sexual assault, the Dean of Students have the ability to retain jurisdiction as is now the case. However, the Dean should notify the Judicial Council when he or she has retained jurisdiction.

G. Faculty Involvement

The Task Force recognizes that one way of fostering a better social atmosphere on campus is to create a better intellectual atmosphere. In its academic programs, teaching, quality of the faculty and instructional facilities, Middlebury compares favorably with any of the leading liberal arts colleges. But students and faculty often complain that life outside the classroom is disappointingly lacking in intellectual content and in continuity with what goes on inside the classroom. Many of these individuals claim that, instead, a "party atmosphere" prevails at Middlebury to a greater extent than at some of the schools with which we most often compare ourselves.

Campus social life should involve an atmosphere which is intellectually stimulating as well as relaxed and enjoyable.

Therefore, the Task Force recommends:

23. The College should work to increase the faculty presence on campus outside the classroom. Among the ways this might be accomplished are:

a) Increase faculty-student interaction through opportunities for discussion at meal-times. Sufficient monies should be allocated to enhance this program.

Rationale:

For years there has been a program whereby students can invite faculty to lunch, but it has been ill publicized and has fallen into almost complete disuse. During the late 1970s and early 1980s the program was confined to Tuesdays and Thursdays, and it was not uncommon to find ten or twenty faculty interspersed with students at lunch in a single SDU. At one time there was even a group of students who met with faculty to discuss how the program could be publicized and developed to maximize student-faculty contact. Changes in student attitudes, in dining patterns, and in pressures on faculty, have all contributed to the demise of the student-faculty lunch program. A concerted effort to restore this program to prominence, and perhaps to expand it to other meals, would be a modest start toward increasing student-faculty contact outside the classroom. As it currently operates, faculty need to be invited by a student to eat in the dining hall. The Task Force believes faculty should be free to eat in the dining halls on their own initiative and not wait for a student invitation, as students are often reluctant to invite faculty members.

b) The College should introduce a program of faculty affiliation with the residence halls.

Rationale:

The faculty could play a greater role in bridging the gap between the academic and nonacademic aspects of life at Middlebury. Over the years there have been numerous discussions of how that role might be developed. At one point several faculty had offices in dormitories; that experiment was a failure because of the cross purposes of faculty research and study, and student recreational needs.

It has been suggested that faculty live in the dorms. Given a different residential structure that might have a significant positive influence, but it would require major renovations to provide attractive living spaces for faculty and their families. Free accommodations in exchange for a role in dorm life might be enough incentive to attract some faculty to the dorms, but more likely it would also be necessary to provide some recognition of this nonclassroom, nonscholarly role for junior faculty in the review process. Since the kinds of renovations necessary take time, it seems preferable that a gradual move to institute "faculty affiliates" should be undertaken. This program could begin with an affiliation which could include seminars or occasional meals. As dormitories are renovated, and where facilities lend themselves, a faculty resident should be considered. Faculty residents could be included as part of the "cluster" or commons system, if fraternities are replaced. The

faculty resident program would have to be carefully planned so as not to infringe on the rights of students or faculty. The Task Force recognizes that if faculty are to be more involved in student social life it will be necessary to have their contributions in this area count positively when they are being considered for reappointment and tenure. It is recommended that this matter be carefully reviewed by College administration.

c) The College should increase current programming efforts to offer more opportunities for student-faculty interaction in the evenings.

Rationale:

It is important to continue to offer events that will draw both students and faculty in the evening. Often the more "intellectual" events like lectures by distinguished visitors are less attended by students and are dominated instead by faculty, staff and adults from the local community. The College should seek ways to ensure a mix of students and faculty at such events, and, equally important, provide opportunities for student-faculty interaction after such events. The latter might, for example, include a coffee house type situation where students and faculty could mingle for discussion.

Another variety of this type of interaction could be a lecture or program followed by student-faculty discussions held in individual dorms.

d) The College should institute a monthly or bi-monthly convocation series.

Rationale:

Whatever is done to increase the faculty presence after hours, it must be recognized that for faculty members with children especially, evening is generally a time away from the College. Therefore, more thought and effort should be given to increasing out-of-class contact between students and faculty during the day. Some years ago there was a proposal by the "Lopez Committee" for a weekly or monthly convocation, to be held late on a Tuesday or Thursday morning, with no classes scheduled during that time. The convocation would feature a talk or presentation of high quality and general interest. Following the convocation, faculty would join students at lunch in the dining halls for discussion of the convocation. That proposal ultimately led to the Winter Term convocation series (without the dining/discussion component) which in a few years has all but vanished.

A proposal like that of the "Lopez Committee" would have had the effect of regularizing student-faculty contact outside the classroom, in a context ripe for discussion. Funding for speakers to participate in this series needs to be allocated.

24. An ad hoc committee on student-faculty relations should be

established. Its primary goal would be to establish and actively encourage growth in a variety of activities aimed at bringing students and faculty together regularly, informally, and comfortably outside the classroom.

Rationale:

This committee could coordinate and take responsibility for developing an overall, cohesive plan to increase student-faculty interaction outside the classroom. Additional funds need to be allocated to increase these opportunities. Such interactions might include a series of desserts held at faculty members' homes or invitations for faculty to serve as advisors to student organizations and activities.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Faculty

FROM: Ann Craig Hanson, Associate Dean of the College
Co-Chair, Task Force on Student Social Life

DATE: March 24, 1989

As part of our "self-study" in preparation for reaccreditation, Middlebury College has identified five aspects of interest to study. One of these areas is student social life. A Task Force, chaired by Judge Albert Coffrin and me is soliciting input from a variety of constituencies including the faculty. Task Force members include:

Patrick Aylmer '90
Peter Chenevert, Security
Albert Coffrin, Overseer
John DeMatte '90
Francesca Fontes '92
Frank Kelley, Residential Life
Bethany Ladimer, French
Margaret Lynch, '89
Pat Palmer, Trustee
Kyle Prescott, Trustee
Steven Rockefeller, Religion
Pam Small, Biology
Gail Smith, Athletics
John Spencer, History
Ali Wilson '91
Rich Wolfson, Physics
Anne Hoover, Committee Coord.

The Task Force on Student Social Life has identified a few areas of particular interest on which to focus our inquiry. These areas include:

a) The role of alcohol and substance abuse as it relates to social life, with a specific focus on its role in residence halls and fraternities.

b) The role of residence halls in social life with a specific focus on examining the impact of all freshmen residence halls, block draws and special interest housing, faculty affiliation with residence halls, a greater focus on intellectual activities, current staffing, and facility limitations.

c) The role of fraternities in social life with particular emphasis on the charges that fraternities promote anti-intellectualism, exclusivity, sexism and elitism. We will also examine carefully the positive aspects of fraternities on campus.

While the faculty vote reveals the basic faculty sentiment with regard to fraternities, we would like to encourage you to let us know your views on any of the issues mentioned above. We wish to encourage any faculty members who would like to provide input either to:

1) provide a written statement to me (c/o Dean of Students Office, Old Chapel 2) by May 5.

or

2) attend a meeting of the Task Force scheduled for Wednesday, April 12 in Kirk from 4:30-6:00. At this meeting we hope to discuss these issues with Faculty.

We hope interested faculty members will use either of these channels to provide their opinions to the Task Force. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

ACH:dlp

APPENDIX B

MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE
MIDDLEBURY, VERMONT 05753
(802) 388-3711

April 24, 1989

Dean of Students' Office

Dear Student:

As part of the Middlebury College reaccreditation study, a Task Force has been appointed to study student social life. The Task Force has been asked to assess the way student social life has changed in the past ten years and in the process to focus on the fraternities.

In order to complete our assignment we are soliciting input from faculty, staff, parents, alumni, trustees, overseers and students. A subcommittee, chaired by Frank Kelley, is collecting input from students. As part of this process, we are sampling students to solicit their input. Could you please take 10-15 minutes and complete the enclosed survey? All responses will be confidential. Students have been assigned numbers which are included in order to follow-up non-respondents. No student names will be associated with the numbers for purposes other than follow-up.

Thank you for your assistance.

Ann Craig Hanson, Chair
Task Force on Student Social Life

Members of Task Force:

Robert Aylmer, 1990
Peter Chenevert, Security
Judge Albert Coffrin, Overseer
John DeMatte, 1990
Francesca Fontes, 1992
Ann Craig Hanson, Dean
Frank Kelley, Dir. of Residential Life
Bethany Ladimer, French
Margie Lynch, 1989
Patricia Palmer, Trustee
W. Kyle Prescott, Trustee
Steven Rockefeller, Religion
Pam Small, Biology
Gail Smith, Athletics
John Spencer, History
Curt Viebranz, Alumni Assoc.
Ali Wilson, 1991
Rich Wolfson, Physics

Dear Student:

A few days ago you were sent a Survey from the Task Force on Student Social Life. If you have not filled it out, could you please take ten minutes to complete it and return it in the envelope which was provided?

If you have returned it, please disregard this reminder.

Thank you,

Ann Craig Hanson, Chair
Task Force on Student
Social Life

TASK FORCE ON STUDENT SOCIAL LIFE

Survey of Students

Background Information:

1. Sex 47.9% Male 52.1% Female

2. Class 24.1% 89 13.5 90 31.6 91 30.9 92 — Other

3. Race/Ethnicity 79.1 White 5.7 Black 3.9 Hispanic 8.5 Asian 2.8 Other

4. United States Citizen 85.5 Yes ____ No
   a) If No: Country/Area of citizenship

   1.4 Canada 1.8 Europe 1.1 Africa — Middle East 6.3 Asia 2.5 Other

5. Current Residence 92.9 Dormitory 2.5 Fraternity 3.9 Off Campus

6. Are you currently a fraternity member? 14.2 Yes 83.3 No

Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly Disagree (4)	No Opinion (5)	
					A. General Experience
					7. The aspects of Middlebury that I value highly are:
72%	25.2	—	—	.4	a) academics
48.9	44.7	3.9	—	1.4	b) the faculty
23.8	45	14.2	1.8	14.5	c) athletics (intercollegiate, intramural, informal)
3.5	30.9	34.4	17.4	12.8	d) social aspects of the town of Middlebury
59.6	35.5	1.8	.7	2.1	e) natural environment
23.4	47.9	15.6	8.9	3.2	f) the social experience
58.5	33.3	4.6	.7	2.1	g) a few close friends
21.6	30.9	17.0	19.5	9.6	h) fraternities
18.1	50.0	14.2	1.1	16.0	i) college organizations (E.Q., W.R.M.C., Mountain Club, Student Government, etc.)
19.9	58.2	10.6	2.5	7.1	j) college organized events (i.e. movies, lectures, performances)
29.4	52.5	11.0	1.4	4.6	k) facilities
					8. I am very satisfied with my overall experience at Middlebury

Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly Disagree (4)	No Opinion (5)		
6.7	40.8	33.0	14.2	2.1	9.	I am very satisfied with social life at the college.
2.8	24.8	46.8	16.3	7.1	10.	I am very satisfied with social programs offered by the college.
14.2	52.1	22.0	6.7	3.9	11.	I seldom feel lost or lonely.
46.1	44.7	6.4	1.1	1.4	12.	I have found a group of friends at this college who make me feel at home.
35.8	37.2	16.7	5.0	2.5	13.	I feel I belong here.
13.5	37.2	33.0	11.7	3.2	14.	There is a real sense of "community" on this campus.
11.0	36.5	34.8	13.1	3.5	15.	I have a strong sense of identity with my class.
16.0	38.3	32.3	9.6	2.8	16.	I know lots of students in all four classes.
4.3	48.6	25.2	10.6	7.1	17.	Middlebury students are considerate of the rights of others.
9.6	21.3	47.9	12.4	3.5	18.	Night-time social life at Middlebury is a bore.
31.6	47.9	8.5	5.3	6.4	19.	When I raise a question with a faculty member, I am not concerned that he/she will pigeonhole me in a particular ethnic/racial/religious/sexual group in formulating the response.
2.5	31.6	37.2	12.8	12.4	20.	Students <u>without</u> a lot of money feel comfortable on this campus.
7.8	51.1	15.6	2.1	18.8	21.	International students feel welcome on this campus.
2.1	20.9	39.4	27.7	7.8	22.	Students on this campus are tolerant of differences in sexual orientation.
6.0	25.2	45.4	18.4	4.3	23.	Since I have been at Middlebury I have felt strong pressures to conform to certain behaviors, dress patterns, etc.

Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly Disagree (4)	No Opinion (5)	
10.3	56.0	20.2	5.3	5.3	24. Students on this campus are tolerant of differences in race and ethnicity.
17.4	64.5	7.1	2.4	7.8	25. Students on this campus are toler- religious differences.
7.8	40.1	33.7	9.6	7.1	26. Social relations among students from diverse backgrounds are very good on this campus.
11.3	44.7	15.2	2.5	23.0	27. When issues of stereotyping (sexist, racist, etc.) arise in class, the instructor is effective in encouraging the class to be aware of and examine these stereotypes.
7.4	33.7	18.4	9.2	27.7	28. When an abusive incident occurs on this campus and is reported to the deans, it is handled appropriately

29. How would you describe social life at Middlebury? (check one)

19.1 highly pressured
47.2 active, but not highly pressured
19.1 relaxed
8.2 no opinion

check	not		30. I have observed: (check all that apply)
19.9	79.1	__	a) racism/a racist action in the residence halls
7.8	91.8	__	b) racism/a racist action in the fraternities
16.0	83.7	__	c) racism/a racist action at another location on this campus
15.6	83.7	__	d) racism/a racist action in the town of Middlebury or its environs
43.6	55.3	__	e) sexism/a sexist action in the residence halls
38.3	61.3	__	f) sexism/a sexist action in the fraternities
34.9	64.2	__	g) sexism/a sexist action at another location on this campus
18.8	80.1	__	h) sexism/a sexist action in the town of Middlebury or its environs

0	1-3	4-6	7-9	10 or more	31. Estimate the hours per week you spend on: (check the column which most correctly reflects your habits)
11.0	46.1	20.2	6.4	9.2	a) hobbies
12.1	27.0	22.0	11.0	24.1	b) athletics
42.9	7.1	14.9	16.3	12.8	c) job
.4	—	3.9	11.7	83.0	d) attending class or lab
—	2.1	7.4	15.2	74.1	e) studying, doing homework
38.3	26.6	17.7	9.9	3.9	f) socializing at: 1) a fraternity house
55.7	29.8	10.3	.7	—	2) bars in town
65.6	21.6	4.3	1.8	1.4	3) out of town
3.9	19.1	25.9	21.3	28.7	4) informal social (conversations, TV, movies...)
41.1	41.8	7.4	3.2	.7	5) college organizations (EQ, WRMC, etc.)
11.3	67.0	14.9	1.8	.4	6) college organized events (movies, speakers)
8.5	34.0	34.4	9.6	11.0	7) outdoor recreation

B. Alcohol Use

Please respond to the following questions:

Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly Disagree (4)	No Opinion (5)	
22.3	37.9	33.0	2.5	2.8	32. Alcohol abuse is a serious problem on campus
16.3	59.2	18.8	2.1	3.5	33. Students know the alcohol policy.
.7	7.1	47.9	37.6	4.6	34. Students uphold the alcohol policy.
11.3	31.6	34.4	4.3	17.0	35. Non-alcohol drug use on this campus is a serious problem.
17.0	39.0	28.0	3.9	9.9	36. The College could do more to promote responsible drinking.
11.7	24.5	41.5	7.1	13.5	37. The College could do more to enforce the alcohol and drug policies.
4.6	14.9	43.3	25.9	9.9	38. At social events, I regularly see non-alcoholic drug use.
36.9	35.1	8.5	8.5	9.2	39. The new student center Pub should serve alcohol.

check N=40. Identify all the places you drink:

81.2 17.7 ___ parties
73.8 25.2 ___ residence halls
64.9 34.0 ___ fraternities
56.4 43.3 ___ downtown
30.9 67.7 ___ MCAB events

41. Among my friends, non-alcoholic drugs are used by:
48.6 less than 5% 15.6 5-10% 8.9 11-20% 12.4 21-40%
9.6 over 40%

42. With regard to drinking, how would you describe yourself? (Check one, using your own definition)

15.2 Non-drinker
33.0 Light drinker
42.6 Moderate drinker
5.3 Heavy drinker
.1 Problem drinker

43. On an average night at Middlebury when you are drinking, how much do you drink?

15.2 I am a non-drinker
14.5 more than 6 beers or 6 glasses of wine or 6 mixed drinks
16.7 5 or 6 beers or 5-6 glasses of wine __ 5-6 mixed drinks
28.7 3 or 4 beers or 3-4 glasses of wine or 3-4 mixed drinks
21.6 1 or 2 beers or 1-2 glasses of wine or 1-2 mixed drinks

44. In an average week, I drink on:

.7 7 days
.4 6 days
1.1 5 days
2.5 4 days
18.1 3 days
26.2 2 days
26.2 1 day
18.4 no days

Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly Disagree (4)	No Opinion (5)	C. Intellectual Atmosphere
20.2	58.2	14.2	4.3	1.8	45. I find the intellectual atmosphere at Middlebury College stimulating.
8.5	53.9	28.0	5.0	1.8	46. Questions raised in my course work are often the topic of conversation in social situations outside the class.
3.2	15.2	59.2	19.5	2.1	47. My academic interests and courses have been a major factor in determining my friends.
31.9	52.8	12.4	.4	2.1	48. I feel comfortable approaching faculty members outside the classroom.
8.9	46.5	21.3	6.0	14.5	49. Faculty members care about students' personal lives.
					50. It would contribute to the intellectual environment on this campus if faculty had contact with students in:
19.5	50.4	18.1	3.2	6.4	a) the dining halls
4.3	12.8	36.5	32.3	11.7	b) the fraternities
57	21.3	43.6	17.0	10.6	c) the residence halls
7.8	35.1	29.1	8.9	15.2	d) the Undergraduate
25.2	60.3	5.3	2.5	6.0	e) student organizations
30.1	60.3	2.1	1.1	5.3	f) special interest groups/student organizations
27.3	53.5	8.2	1.4	7.4	g) faculty homes

51. Frequently I discuss ideas and theories raised in my course work in: (check all that apply)

check	DOT		
58.5	39.7	___	a) the Library
79.4	19.1	___	b) the dining halls
25.5	73.4	___	c) in the Undergraduate
82.6	16.0	___	d) in the residence halls
22.0	77.3	___	e) in the fraternities
18.4	80.5	___	f) in the field house, playing fields or on team trips away from campus.

Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly Disagree (4)	No Opinion (5)	D. **Residence Halls:** Several changes have been discussed as possible new directions for residence
42.6	32.6	10.6	7.8	4.3	52. All Freshman residences should be retained.
7.1	12.8	44.0	33.0	2.1	53. All residence halls should be integrated with all four classes.
22.7	50.7	12.4	7.1	6.7	54. Special interest or theme houses should be an option for students.
6.4	16.3	41.5	20.6	14.5	55. Faculty should be more involved with residence halls.
26.6	37.9	14.2	1.4	18.4	56. Students should be allowed to have more block draws.
14.9	40.1	24.1	3.2	16.7	57. More programs supportive of intellectual life should occur in residence halls.
5.0	5.3	29.8	54.6	4.6	58. Residence halls should be locked by midnight each night.
5.0	19.9	56.7	13.8	2.8	59. The following are serious problems in the residence halls. a) lack of privacy
14.5	30.5	44.3	5.3	2.8	b) noise level
1.8	12.8	55.0	23.0	4.3	c) stealing
26.2	49.3	18.4	2.5	2.1	d) damage to college property
7.1	28.4	46.5	8.9	7.8	e) crowding
7.4	22.0	53.9	8.9	5.3	f) maintenance
18.8	38.3	35.1	2.1	3.5	g) mess in halls and bathrooms
21.6	42.2	26.6	3.2	3.5	h) lack of adequate social space
3.5	7.1	42.2	39.7	4.3	i) lack of adequate supervision
14.6	1.1	1.1	.7	5.7	j) other (please specify) _____

60. If theme houses are instituted, I would like to have a theme house for: _____

Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly Disagree (4)	No Opinion (5)	If this happens I would join: Yes	No		
								E. FRATERNITIES
26.6	17.4	23.4	22.3	7.8	12.8	41.5	61.	Middlebury should keep fraternities in their present form.
9.2	25.9	31.9	16.3	12.4	11.0	37.9	62.	Middlebury should keep fraternities, but change them.
7.4	5.0	23.0	41.8	19.5	4.6	38.3	63.	Fraternities should stop using Greek letters.
9.2	11.7	22.3	31.2	21.6	6.0	36.2	64.	Fraternities should drop affiliations with their nationals.
11.0	11.3	21.3	37.2	16.7	5.3	37.9	65.	Fraternities should change their name from fraternity to a gender-free term.
21.6	24.5	20.6	18.8	10.3	9.9	36.2	66.	Fraternities should have full and equal participation by women.
30.5	43.3	7.8	5.3	9.9	19.9	23.0	67.	Co-ed residential units/clubs should be established on this campus.
13.5	20.2	18.4	27.7	17.0	6.7	31.2	68.	Sororities should be established on this campus.
8.2	24.1	22.7	19.5	19.9	5.0	29.4	69.	Women-Only Social/Residential Clubs should be established on this campus.
12.4	8.5	16.3	52.1	7.8			70.	Fraternities should be abolished.
15.2	13.5	23.0	23.8	11.3			71.	At Middlebury, fraternities promote:
10.6	8.5	26.6	25.9	16.0				a) anti-intellectualism
16.3	20.6	18.4	19.9	14.2				b) racism
20.2	20.6	20.6	19.1	8.2				c) homophobia
21.3	27.3	20.9	13.8	7.4				d) sexism
								e) exclusivity

Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly Disagree (4)	No Opinion (5)	
30.9	30.9	12.8	7.4	16.0	72. Fraternities offer a positive social alternative for their members.
40.8	41.5	1.8	3.2	10.3	73. Fraternities offer an opportunity for camaraderies.

74. The following reasons would or did influence my decision to join a fraternity. Please rank order your first three choices.

	1st	2nd	3rd
a) shared interest	7.4	9.2	10.6
b) opportunity to develop responsibilities and independence	1.8	3.2	4.6
c) parties	1.8	2.1	9.2
d) advantages of national affiliation (scholarships, etc.)	.7	2.1	4.6
e) leadership opportunities	1.4	3.9	3.9
f) opportunity to meet new and different people	11.7	13.5	6.4
g) opportunity to establish close friendships	24.1	13.1	5.0
h) other (specify)	.4	.7	1.4

Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly Disagree (4)	No Opinion (5)	
39.0	36.9	10.3	4.6	6.4	75. The fraternities provide an important service to the college through: a) social events
22.0	42.2	14.2	5.7	13.8	b) community service
14.6	33.7	20.9	8.5	18.8	c) involvement in the larger community
20.9	35.5	16.0	6.0	17.7	d) a sense of identity with members
33.0	42.6	7.1	5.7	6.4	e) parties
12.8	18.4	24.5	32.6	8.8	76. The fraternities are not an essential element in the Middlebury community

77. In a paragraph or less, please describe what you believe would be an ideal social environment.

APPENDIX C

MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE
MIDDLEBURY, VERMONT 05753
(802) 388-3711

Dean of Students' Office

May 17, 1989

Dear Friends of Middlebury College:

As part of the Middlebury College reaccreditation study, a task force has been appointed to study student social life. The task force has been asked to assess the ways student social life has changed in the past ten years and in the process to focus on fraternities.

In order to complete our assignment we are soliciting input from faculty, staff, parents, students, alumni, trustees and overseers.

We are conducting a survey of random sample of alumni, parents, trustees and overseers. Could you please take 10-15 minutes and complete the survey and return it in the enclosed envelope? All responses will be confidential. Surveys have been assigned numbers which are included in order to follow-up non-respondents. No names will be associated with numbers for purposes other than follow-up.

We value your input and hope you will assist us in our task.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Kyle Prescott, Trustee
Pat Palmer, Trustee
Curt Viebranz, President, Alumni Council

ACH:kk

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Sex: Male 46.2 Female 53.8

2. Class - (Year of graduation from College/University)

0	Pre 1920
2.5	1920-1929
5.9	1930-1939
9.5	1940-1949
16.2	1950-1959
24.0	1960-1969
18.1	1970-1979
23.9	1980- present

3. Are you a: (check all that apply)

24.1	Parent of a currently enrolled student
74.6	Alumni
1.9	Trustee
3.2	Overseer

4. Did you attend Middlebury College? yes 79.0 no 21.0
   Were you a member of a fraternity? yes 37.1 no 62.9
   Were you a member of a sorority? yes 27.5 no 72.5

5. Were you satisfied with your Middlebury College experience?
   78.6 very 20.0 somewhat 1.4 not at all

If you are a parent of a <u>current</u> Middlebury student please answer the following questions:

6. Indicate the number of <u>current</u> Middlebury students in your family. (percentages of total respondents)

10.9 male	3.3	89	4.3	90	3.3	91	2.3	92	.05	other
11.1 female	3.2	89	4.2	90	2.8	91	2.5	92	.06	other

7. My child is a member of a fraternity?
   22.8 yes 77.2 No

8. Have you been satisfied with your child(ren) 's experience at Middlebury.

91.0 yes 9.0 no

9. How do you keep in touch with what is happening at the College? (check all that apply)

19.1 Parents newsletter
12.6 Campus Newspaper
52.3 Alumni Magazine
31.9 Campus Visits
26.0 Classmates/friends
21.1 Children/friends of your children
8.2 Other

10. How would you rate your knowledge of what is going on at Middlebury College with regard to student social life?

19.4 out of touch/no idea
50.9 some knowledge
25.2 pretty current
4.5 great deal of information

General Experience:

If you attended Middlebury College please answer question 11.

11. When assessing my own Middlebury experience, I highly value:

Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly Disagree (4)	No Opinion (5)	
56.3	41.1	1.4	.05	.07	a. the curriculum
26.4	51.0	9.5	2.5	10.5	b. athletics (intercollegiate, intramural, informal)
31.6	55.7	7.5	.05	4.7	c. the town of Middlebury
73.3	25.6	.7	—	.4	d. the natural environment
34.6	49.3	12.6	2.3	1.3	e. the social experience
63.0	31.9	2.6	.4	2.0	f. a few close friends
16.7	32.1	21.3	18.1	11.7	g. the fraternities
8.0	16.0	20.1	16.8	39.2	h. sororities
19.7	46.2	13.3	3.7	17.6	i. college organizations (EQ, WRMC, Mountain Club, Student Government, etc.)
31.4	52.5	9.1	1.7	5.3	j. College organized events (movies, lectures, performances)
53.3	41.5	3.5	.4	1.4	k. faculty
-	-	-	-	-	l. facilities
11.9	44.0	23.5	7.2	13.5	m. College organized parties and dances
21.3	40.5	19.9	8.0	10.3	12. Social relations among students from diverse backgrounds are good at Middlebury College.

If your child attends Middlebury College please answer question 13.

Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly Disagree (4)	No Opinion (5)		
66.2	30.1	2.6	.4	.8	13.	When assessing my child's Middlebury experience, I highly value:
28.5	49.4	6.1	.7	14.6	a.	the curriculum
32.4	55.7	3.4	.4	8.0	b.	athletics (intercollegiate, intramural, informal)
56.1	41.2	1.5	—	1.1	c.	the town of Middlebury
29.4	52.5	9.8	4.7	3.5	d.	the natural environment
47.2	40.9	4.3	.4	7.1	e.	the social experience
12.8	24.5	19.5	21.0	22.2	f.	a few close friends
4.9	8.0	18.1	17.3	51.8	g.	the fraternities
17.4	45.2	10.0	.4	27.0	h.	sororities
26.5	52.1	7.8	.4	13.2	i.	college organizations, (EQ, WRMC, Mountain Club, Student Government, etc.)
54.2	37.5	3.2	.4	4.7	j.	College organized events (movies, lectures, performances)
39.0	53.1	3.9	.4	3.5	k.	the faculty
14.1	37.9	12.5	5.1	30.5	l.	facilities
10.2	32.6	22.1	9.9	25.1	m.	College organized parties and dances
					14.	Gender issues are not a problem at Middlebury College.

Alcohol Use and Substance Abuse:

Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly Disagree (4)	No Opinion (5)	15.
12.4	32.3	22.6	2.6	30.3	a. Alcohol use on the Middlebury campus is excessive.
10.8	44.7	7.7	1.7	35.1	b. Students know the alcohol policy.
1.1	6.9	35.8	16.3	39.9	c. Students adhere to the alcohol policy.
6.0	18.5	23.3	4.5	47.7	d. Non-alcohol drug use on this campus is excessive.
16.3	42.7	10.2	2.7	28.1	e. The college could do more to promote responsible drinking.
15.1	34.6	14.4	4.0	31.9	f. The college could do more to enforce alcohol and drug policies.
13.6	40.3	16.1	13.7	16.4	g. Students should be able to purchase alcohol (beer/wine) at a campus pub.

Intellectual Atmosphere:

Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly Disagree (4)	No Opinion (5)	
37.3	47.1	3.5	.6	4.6	16. a. The intellectual atmosphere at Middlebury College is stimulating.
33.9	47.9	2.3	.5	7.5	b. Middlebury faculty members care about their students.
					c. It would contribute to the intellectual environment on this campus if faculty had greater affiliation and contact with students in:
14.3	42.6	15.6	2.7	14.6	1. The dining halls
7.0	21.7	24.7	13.5	20.8	2. The fraternities
7.7	32.5	25.5	7.8	15.2	3. The residence halls
10.6	44.0	12.4	3.1	18.3	4. The Undergraduate (non-alcohol pub)
9.1	40.9	15.9	3.5	19.2	5. Student Social spaces
20.1	49.0	6.3	1.2	13.3	6. Faculty homes
18.9	51.3	3.7	1.2	14.0	7. Field trips

Residence Halls:

Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly Disagree (4)	No Opinion (5)		
					17.	Several changes have been discussed as possible new directions for residence halls. Please respond to the questions below:
11.1	33.7	33.0	11.6	10.6	a.	Residence halls should integrate the four classes.
14.3	56.2	10.3	3.3	9.5	b.	Special interest or theme houses should be an option for students.
8.9	42.4	21.4	6.0	13.2	c.	There should be an opportunity for greater faculty involvement with residence halls.
8.3	43.0	14.5	2.4	23.3	d.	More programs should occur in residence halls.
12.0	24.7	25.7	13.6	13.6	e.	Residence halls should be locked late at night.
					f.	The following are problems in the residence halls:
8.5	25.2	28.6	2.4	23.0		1. lack of privacy
18.0	34.7	13.4	.4	21.5		2. noise level
3.0	13.8	24.6	2.6	42.2		3. stealing
15.2	32.3	11.0	.7	28.5		4. damage to college property
7.6	21.3	26.6	1.1	31.0		5. crowding
4.7	19.5	30.1	2.1	37.0		6. maintenance
12.4	28.1	18.1	.8	28.1		7. mess in halls and bathrooms
9.5	28.8	19.5	1.2	28.1		8. lack of adequate social space
5.9	16.4	29.1	7.4	28.3		9. lack of adequate supervision
2.4	1.5	.9	.2	19.0		10. other (please specify)

Fraternities:

Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Disagree (3)	Strongly Disagree (4)	No Opinion (5)		
16.6	22.0	23.5	15.7	22.2	18.	Middlebury should keep fraternities in their current form.
6.0	21.1	30.1	16.5	26.3	19.	Middlebury should keep fraternities, but change them.
3.2	7.3	25.3	28.1	36.2	20.	Fraternities should stop using Greek letters.
5.2	12.6	26.3	24.3	31.7	21.	Fraternities should drop affiliations with their national organizations.
6.2	12.9	25.6	29.9	25.5	22.	Fraternities should change their name from fraternity to a gender-free term.
15.5	27.6	18.8	18.4	19.7	23.	Fraternities should have full and equal participation by women.
21.1	9.7	25.4	36.1	16.7	24.	Fraternities should be abolished.
8.4	14.7	21.7	16.7	21.7	25.	At Middlebury fraternities promote:
7.4	11.7	22.5	17.9	22.4		a. anti-intellectualism
7.4	13.9	19.3	15.5	24.5		b. racism
11.5	23.0	16.7	13.5	18.2		c. homophobia
12.0	22.8	17.6	14.0	16.7		d. sexism
						e. elitism
18.8	42.4	15.2	7.4	16.1	26.	Fraternities offer a positive social alternative for their members.
26.7	60.3	2.8	1.5	8.7	27.	Fraternities offer an opportunity for camaraderie.
					28.	Fraternities provide an important service to the college through:
17.6	39.2	12.0	7.1	11.0		a. parties
14.2	39.4	10.4	3.8	17.8		b. intramural teams
12.1	36.3	11.5	4.9	21.5		c. charitable involvement in the larger community.
8.6	39.2	10.2	4.8	14.5		d. sense of identity and brotherhood
12.8	27.2	20.6	20.5	10.0	29.	Fraternities are not an essential element in the Middlebury community.

***Please add any comments you wish to make on the back of this page.**

APPENDIX D
TASK FORCE ON STUDENT SOCIAL LIFE
Documents, Reports and Background Materials
(Available to all Members)

Reports and Documents:

1. Toward the Year 2000: A Basic Ten-Year Planning Document, Middlebury College, 1988

2. Report of the Special Committee on Campus, Social, Residential and Dining Arrangements, 1977, (Albert W. Coffrin, Chair)

3. Constitution of the Middlebury College Inter-Fraternity Council (2/87)

4. Student Government Association Resolutions regarding fraternities (No date)

5. Faculty Council Recommendations on Fraternities, 11/7/88

6. "21" Committee Report - 1988

7. Report from Karl Lindholm on the Student Center (No date)

8. Thesis submitted by M. Morgan Hildesley, "A Study of the Interaction between the Custodians & Students of Middlebury College," 2/3/89

9. "Middlebury's Agenda for Minorities: Priorities and Goals," 1/89

10. Report of Student Activities Office for 1987-88, 8/8/88

11. Cooperative Institutional Research Program Data, 2/28/89

12. "Middlebury and Greek Letter Societies: Do They Belong Together?" (Thesis on Fraternities, 11/88, by Lauren Preston)

13. Report on the Minority Advisory Workshop 1988: "You've Done Good. Do Some More."

14. Report to the Task Force by John Myhre, 1978, re Fraternities, 5/11/89

15. Comparative Analysis with Other Colleges, prepared by Patricia Palmer, May, 1989

16. "A Study of Drinking Attitudes & Behavior on Middlebury Campus," prepared for SA 301, Rudolph K. Haerle, Jr., Spring, 1985

17. "A Study of Personal and Social Adjustment at Middlebury," prepared for SA 301, Rudolph K. Haerle, Jr., May, 1989

18. Reports by Frank Kelley on: (1988)

    a. "Comments on Residence Halls"

    b. "Job Description for Junior Counselor"

    c. "Job Description for House Director"

    d. "Dorm and House Capacities"

19. Middlebury College Handbook excerpts on Drugs & Alcohol Policy, pp. 71-73

20. Middlebury College Handbook excerpts on Fraternities, pp. 75-80

21. Student Thesis "Violence Against Absolute Human Beings" or "Two Nutty Guys out of Control?" - Students' Interpretations of the 'DU' Mannequin, by Karen P. Cargill

22. Survey Comparisons - General Experience

23. Material pertinent to review of Delta Upsilon in March 1989

24. "Alcohol Use at Middlebury"

25. "Drugs and Alcohol: Your Accountability and Responsiblity at Mdidlebury"

Pertinent Memoranda:

1. 1/5/89 Memo from John Emerson and Karl Lindholm re Rushing

2. 1/22/89 Memo to Jon Lenicheck from Frank Kelley re Dormitory Damages and Fines

3. 1/22/89 Memo from M. Lynch - "Student social life from my perspective"

4. 1/23/89 Memo from Cathy Walsh, Jim Terhune & Anya Puri to Ann Hanson re Task Force, with enclosures: Social Activities Fall 1988 & List of Middlebury College Student Organizations

5. 1/23/89 Memo from Gail Smith to Ann Hanson re Student Social Life

6. 2/8/89 Memo from John Emerson to Ann Hanson - "Initial Thoughts for Special Committee on Student Social Life"

7. 2/17/89 Memo from John Emerson to Ann Hanson - Perspectives on Student Residential & Social Life

8. 2/23/89 Memo from John Emerson enclosing information about fraternities at other colleges

9. 3/14/89 Memo to the Community Council from DU fraternity re Review of DU

10. 3/24/89 Memo re Pomona College Alcohol Policy

11. 4/5/89 Memo from Ann Hanson to Task Force re Wesleyan visit

12. 4/10/89 Memo from John Emerson to Ann Hanson - Perspectives on the Fraternity Issues; enclosing the following:

    3/27/89 Memo from Jim Terhune re Party Registration Reports '87-'88;
    3/28/89 Confidential Memo from John Emerson to Ann Hanson re Summary of "Incidents and Behavioral Matters at Middlebury Fraternities;"
    3/31/89 Memo from Jim Terhune to Ann Hanson re Incident Reports '86-'87 & '87-'88

13. 4/10/89 Memo to John Emerson and Ann Hanson from Rich Wolfson re Diversity of the Student Body.

14. 4/11/89 Memo from Karl Lindholm to Coffrin Committee II re Fraternities

15. 4/24/89 Memo from Task Force on Composition of Student Body to Task Force on Student Social Life re Special-Interest Housing and Diversity

16. 5/4/89 Memo from Task Force on Composition of Student Body to Task Force on Student Social Life re Concerns Regarding Student Social Life

17. 5/23/89 Memo from John Emerson re McCullough Student Center and Alcohol

18. 8/20/89 Letter from Ali Wilson to Task Force re Residential Life, Fraternities and Minorities

19. 8/23/89 Memo from Ann Hanson to Task Force on Student Social Life re Overview of Student Letters concerning fraternities

20. 8/29/89 Memo from Ann Hanson & Jim Terhune re Comments Written on Parent/Alumni Surveys

21. 9/9/89 Letter from Frank Winkler to Task Force re freshman dorms and regulation of automobiles

22. 9/10/89 Memo from Richard Wolfson to Task Force re dormitory arrangements

23. 9/20/89 Memo from Karl Lindholm to Ann Hanson re Freshman Football Players - Freshman Orientation

24. 9/21/89 Letter from Judge Coffrin to Ann Hanson re fraternities

Information from Other Colleges

1. Amherst College - "Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Trustee Committee on Campus Life," January, 1984

2. Amherst College - "Final Report of the Ad Hoc Trustee Committee on Campus Life," 2/21/84

3. Colby College - "Report for the Overseers Visiting Committee to the Dean of Students Office," January, 1988

4. Colby College - "Report of the Trustee Commission on Campus Life," December, 1983

5. St. Lawrence University - "Faculty Commission on Alternatives to the Greek System," 4/1/87

6. Williams College background documents relating to discontent with fraternities (1966-1976)

Newspaper & Magazine Articles

1. Addison County Independent, "Faculty Down on Frats," 3/16/89

2. New York Times, "Amherst - Prohibition Tried But the Results Familiar," 3/19/89

3. Newsweek on Campus, "Fraternities Under Fire," April, 1988

4. The Nation, "The Greek Rites of Exclusion," July 4/11, 1987

5. The Campus, "Prexy Will Appoint Committee to Study Role of Fraternity in College Community," 1963

6. New York Times, "Taking a hard line: Why have fraternities on this campus to begin with?" (Gettysburg College), 5/11/?

7. The Palm of Alpha Tau Omega, "Are Fraternities Dinosaurs?" Spring, 1988

8. Fraternity Newstrends, "The Supreme Court on private clubs," June, 1988

9. Fraternity Newstrends, "FEA recommends an end to pledgeship," October, 1988

10. Fraternity Newstrends, "Predictions for the end of the '80s," January, 1989

11. The Chronicle of Higher Education, "Fraternities Criticized for Sexual Conduct," 12/14/88

12. The Chronicle of Higher Education, "Fraternities Examine the Pledge System," 12/14/88

13. The Boston Globe, "Middlebury Ponders Social Change," 3/26/89

14. N. Y. Times, "New Dorm Option: Floor That Shuns all Substances" 9/10/89

15. N. Y. Times, "Fraternities Phase out 'Little Sister' Groups," 9/17/89

16. Boston Globe, "Lawsuits, Legislation are New Weapons in War on Campus Rape." 9/25/89

17. "Facing Diversity," by Gregg Mitchel

18. Section 8, "The Women's Issue in the Fraternity Debate," November 1988.

APPENDIX E

A BRIEF RECENT HISTORY OF FRATERNITIES AT MIDDLEBURY

An alumnus from 1967 was conversing with his nephew, a sophomore at Middlebury. In the course of their conversation, the alumnus asked, "Which House do you belong to?"

"Excuse me?"

"Which House, which fraternity, do you belong to. You seem like a regular guy. I'm curious to know which House you joined?"

"Why, it never crossed my mind to join a frat," the young man responded. "I enjoy going to fraternities once in a while, but I don't see myself as a 'brother.'"

This discussion encapsulates the change in the fraternity presence on the Middlebury campus in twenty years or so, reflecting as it does the significant decline in actual fraternity membership. While it would be misleading to suggest that fraternities in 1989 are unimportant, it simply does not cross the minds of many male undergraduates at Middlebury to join a frat. This doesn't mean that they don't attend fraternity parties on occasion, or even regularly. At present, the fraternity situation at Middlebury is an amalgam of old and new: the frats are stronger than they have been in years, the practical result of the drinking age change; at the same time, 80-90% of Middlebury students (60-70% of men) choose not to affiliate themselves with fraternities. The fraternity system allows women membership, but Middlebury women generally have not joined fraternities.

The strength of fraternities at Middlebury in the 1940's, 50's, 60's is well known. They were dominant in the social lives of Middlebury students in those decades. There were as many as a dozen houses, serving a male enrollment of about 750. Nearly all men, fully 90%, joined fraternities; all personalities and interests were represented. The cornerstone of fraternity life was dining. Each day, the entire membership joined together at noon and at dinnertime at the house to eat together.

Though in less significant numbers, women joined sororities during this time. Disbanded in the late 60's, the sororities did not feature dining, and were not residential. The sororities were organized largely around community service and campus social events. The contrast between fraternities and sororities during this time reflects the very different lives of men and women on the Middlebury campus. Here, as elsewhere, a clear "double standard" for social behavior was in effect. Women had hours, were required to conform to a dress code, and were expected generally to comport themselves quite differently from men on campus. The campus protest movement in the late 60's eliminated the most obvious structures of the double standard as well as any interest on the

part of women in Greek organizations. Since that time, there have been no serious efforts by women to return sororities to the Middlebury campus.

In the original Coffrin Committee Report, Middlebury alumnus and faculty member Bruce Peterson described Middlebury fraternities in the post-World War II era, observing their decline in the turbulent 60s and their modest revival in the 70s. He described the policies that bound these organizations and examined those factors which led to the changes which formed the basis for the continuing role of fraternities on campus to this day. One of the influences that Professor Peterson did not cite is the change in the legal drinking age in 1971. Just when the frats were emerging from the campus chaos of the 60s, this change in the legal drinking age from twenty-one to eighteen effectively undermined their social authority. Restaurants and other night spots appeared immediately. With the entire campus legal to drink, the weekend social life moved downtown, where it stayed until the Vermont Legislature returned to a twenty-one year old standard three years ago. For nearly two decades, then, the fraternities were not the center of campus social life. Most Friday and Saturday nights, a lively social scene took place at the Alibi, Mister Ups, The Rosebud Saloon, and Fire and Ice. "Lets go downtown" was truly the social rallying cry. The fraternities held a couple of large "theme" parties a term. The "21" Committee Report of 1985 accurately anticipated the re-emergence of fraternities as social centers after the legal drinking age was raised.

In 1977, at the time of the Coffrin Committee Report, there were six fraternities at Middlebury; in 1989, there are six fraternities. The percentage of students who are actual members of fraternities in 1989 is about the same as the percentage in 1977. While the fraternity system has remained about the same size, much has happened in these intervening twelve years. What follows is a brief and personal summary of the "highlights" of fraternity existence at Middlebury since the last Coffrin Committee Report.

Coffrin Committee Report, 1977: Obviously, the most controversial recommendation of this Committee was to eliminate fraternity dining. Interestingly, the end of fraternity dining was met with a much greater outcry than the actual sale of the houses a few years later.

The problem was the comprehensive fee. Middlebury's payment plan, initiated a few years earlier, replaced the standard room, board, and tuition arrangement which had supported fraternities for decades. The comprehensive fee concept provided "rebates" that approximated costs to the College of feeding students in our dining halls and providing housing in our dormitories. The fraternities felt they were being squeezed by these rebates - and they were right. The College, on the other hand, was disinclined to subsidize these independent social organizations that often

exhibited social behavior that was unacceptable. The end of fraternity dining reinforced the comprehensive fee: all students, except those actually living in the houses, paid the entire fee. The response of fraternity members and alumni to the end of dining was animated, but ultimately short-term.

The Sale of the Houses, 1979-80: A tour of the six fraternity houses in the spring of 1978 left the Trustees horrified at their condition. They decided that these buildings must be renovated if Middlebury students were to live in them. The College, then, made an offer that the fraternities couldn't refuse: the fraternities could renovate to safety code standards, or the College would. When an independent contracting firm examined the houses, the renovation estimates exceeded the value of the houses in four cases - and approximated the value in two other cases. "Slug," SE, KDR, and ZP quickly sold to the College; DU and CP explored financing the renovations themselves but then sold a year later. The College spent 1.4 million dollars on purchase and renovation of the houses and we entered a brave new world of College ownership of fraternities.

The purchase of the houses ended fraternity independence, but ironically insured their survival into the 80's. Slug and ZP were so weak in 1979 that it was likely that they would have been forced to close had not the College taken over the practical costs of building improvement and maintenance. Even the houses with strong memberships and traditions had major physical deficiencies and lacked the capital to provide for even basic maintenance. Some of the houses could not afford heat for part of the winter (though a cynic might add that they found money for beer on a regular basis). The reason the College could take over the houses with almost no resistance was that the fraternities and their alumni corporations could in fact see the handwriting on the wall.

With the purchase of the houses, the College's authority in these spaces was clarified, introducing a responsibility (and liability) that some would regard as onerous, but was nonetheless unambiguous.

The Demise of Slug, 1983, and the Return of DKE, 1985,: The night before registration in May of 1982, the Slug fraternity held their annual "formal" party in the Bread Loaf Barn. Two special security officers were assigned to the party. Their report indicated widespread, public use of cocaine at the party. Because of the difficulty of identifying individuals, and because the party was a "members only" function, the fraternity was held responsible and suspended for two years, with no guarantee of reinstatement and return to their house on South Street. Because of the absence of leadership in Slug and the lack of a strong historical identity, no petition was ever made for Slug's return.

In 1976-77, the College undertook negotiations with the DKE alumni for the purpose of purchasing their property on South Main Street in order to accommodate the expansion of Starr Library. (The DKE chapter at Middlebury had been inactive since its house was destroyed in a fire in 1968.) No agreement was reached that year, despite the College's offer to build a new DKE house in the parking lot adjacent to the Field House. The College expanded the library in an eastward direction rather than southward on the DKE property. In 1985, discussions were again initiated, this time by the DKE alumni, resulting in an agreement and the construction of an alumni house on the original property. This house is not residential for its active members, but does serve as the center for its social activity. DKE is thus back on campus.

Change in the Legal Drinking Age 1986: The Vermont Legislature held out for as long as it could, but eventually succumbed to pressures to raise its drinking age, effecting in essence a national standard again at twenty-one years old. This change produced a renaissance of fraternity influence on college campuses throughout the country. As colleges and universities attempted to respect the law in their own residential spaces, fraternities on most campuses enjoyed independent status and the same legal privileges of other private homeowners (that they routinely invite 200-300 of their closest friends for drinks and entertainment seems not to be an issue).

In Middlebury, when the drinking age went up, two nightspots closed immediately and the restaurant/bars became restaurants primarily. In an instant, social life at Middlebury changed and the frats became the beneficiaries (or "victims," depending on your point of view). With their ample renovated social spaces, they were both commodious and intimate. At present, they again dominate the social scene on weekends. The College, through MCAB and Student Activities, make an extensive effort to offer a social life on weekends outside the fraternities. Nonetheless, students have made clear their preference for the fraternity kind of dance-to-loud music scene to the one offered in College spaces.

In truth, alcohol is more readily available to illegal drinkers at fraternities than at College-sponsored parties. It must be noted, however, that the fraternities do make an effort to respect the law at their parties by identifying students by age and not serving underage drinkers at the bar. It is important to remember that an annual survey of college freshmen indicated that 75% of all entering freshmen (85% of the men) have begun a pattern of socializing with alcohol prior to going to college. Another study revealed that 56% of high school students began drinking in ninth grade, or earlier. These figures are cited only to indicate some of the challenges and limitations confronted by any policy of intervention and control.

The DU Incident, 1988: On the last weekend before exams in May, 1988, DU held a large outdoor party, afternoon and evening. At some point on Saturday afternoon, DU members hung from their second floor window the bloody torso of a female mannequin. It remained suspended from the building throughout most of the weekend. The outrage which followed resulted in DU's probation for two years, the first year of which denied them use of their house. The Community Council, in the spring of 1989, reviewed the fraternity's compensatory behavior and allowed them to return to their building while still on probation.

Subsequent to this incident, the faculty voted 113-13 to eliminate fraternities at Middlebury. The Student Government Association voted by an equally divergent margin to retain fraternities, with unspecified changes. Faculty opponents of fraternities often cite principles in their arguments - the historical intolerance of fraternities, while student defenders often cite practicality - the fraternities have good parties that appeal to men and women alike. Without question, the DU incident forced this most recent reconsideration of fraternities at Middlebury.

Right now, fraternities are enjoying strong leadership and an unusually tranquil existence on campus. With the ax gleaming over their heads, they have been on their best behavior for the past two years, monitoring their parties effectively and participating in community service projects. Despite efforts (sincere on the part of some frats) to recruit women into their memberships, and despite the general acceptance of fraternities on campus by students, only two Middlebury women have chosen to become fraternity members.

Karl Lindholm
Dean of Students

KL:kk

APPENDIX F

CONFIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM

TO: The Task Force on Student Social Life

FROM: Jim Terhune JT

RE: Written Comments on Student Surveys

DATE: October 16, 1989

I have read and reviewed all of the written comments made by students at the end of the survey taken last spring. What follows is an overview of the points which were made and the suggestions students offered.

The one element which is present in almost all of the comments was a negative attitude. There is a strong sense of dissatisfaction with the social alternatives which currently exist and antagonism toward both the faculty and the administration.

It was also clear in many of the comments that large numbers of students are unaware of the social alternatives which do exist on campus and the way in which they are run. There is a perception that any event which is college funded has been planned by "the administration." While many commented that they enjoy MCAB events, etc... it is clear that many students do not understand that MCAB is a student run organization.

Issues about alcohol were raised most frequently. When discussing alcohol an overwhelming number of students stated that they consider alcohol abuse to be a major problem on campus. Ironically, an equally large number want the college to be less strict about enforcing the drinking age. Many students acknowledge that too often alcohol serves as a barrier, separating and isolating those who choose not to drink from those who do. There seems to be a strong sentiment that people wish this were not the case, however, there were very few suggestions as to ways to rectify this situation.

A large number of students said that they want more options for block draws and special interest housing in the residential system. Many students believe that more block draws would create a situation whereby more social alternatives would take place in the residence halls.

Many respondents cited Middlebury's rural location as a major drawback. They want more cultural events and firmly believe the social scene here suffers from a lack of diversity in the student body.

On the subject of fraternities it was clear that a majority are in favor of retaining fraternities in some fashion. They were divided, however, on what form the fraternities should take. Some suggested that fraternities and sororities should both be options. Others said fraternities, sororities, and co-ed houses would offer something for everyone. Most, however, seemed to be in favor of keeping the existing houses but making them co-ed.

While the majority did favor maintaining fraternities, there were also many students who felt strongly that fraternities should be abolished. They cited exclusivity, sexism, and alcohol abuse most often as reasons for abolishment.

What follows is a sampling of comments made by students. Please keep in mind that the question to which they were asked to respond was: "Please describe what you believe would be an ideal social environment."

"Middlebury needs more parties as an alternative to frat parties. With the closing of the Rosebud and Brews, and the increase in the drinking age, Middlebury's social life has decreased dramatically since I was a freshman. This year ('88-'89) with the imposition of an invitation only frat party system, the school succeeded in making the frat system very exclusive. Currently frats provide the largest portion of social life and doing away with them before an alternative is provided will mean the death of Middlebury social life. The current MCAB parties are not adequate alternatives. Perhaps the new student center will help. However, I do believe that the frats have a place in Middlebury social life, though perhaps as coed units."
- Woman '89

"Eighteen year-old drinking age, options downtown, every single person feeling comfortable and happy with their social situation and friends." - Man '91

"One in which other students would respect others' right to be themselves, and follow their own patterns of life. And also, one in which the larger part of the student body accept that not everyone wants/admires their attitudes and actions." - Woman '92

"I like the social environment at Midd right now. I think the fraternities are as they should be and I do not feel excluded in any way because they were not meant for women to join (that's what sororities are for). I am a supporter of women's rights but I think the Women's Union on this campus goes too far and turns everything they possibly can into a sexist issue." - Woman '91

"see Plato's Republic." - Man '91

"An alcohol policy such as one that they have at Pomona College (students are legal on campus) could alleviate some of the behind closed door drinking in freshman and sophomore dorms. The students would have less of a desire to rebel against the liquor laws and simply drink till they are drunk. I think a new responsibility would be taken on." - Woman '92

"Sororities, fraternities, and coed houses. That way everyone will be happy." - Man '89

"An ideal social environment would be comprised of a multitude of offerings during both the week and weekends. At weekend functions, alcohol would be served in a responsible way and fraternities would sponsor open parties. There would not be the hassle of having to purchase a ticket on Wednesday to go to a party on Saturday.
In addition, there would be less division and more informal places for men & women to get together, talk, have a beer, etc... The Undergraduate is a step in the right direction, however, it should and could have been more centrally located, and as at Colby and Bates, should serve alcohol on weekend nights."
- Man '89

"The entire Middlebury scene has become way too tense. We're trying too hard to be Williams or Amherst, and it has become way too uptight here." - Man '89

"Neither fraternities nor sororities should exist because they serve to divide the campus and to isolate many groups. They aren't exactly intellectual hotbeds and they don't do a whole lot in terms of 'community service'. You can't force fraternities to do good - it must come from within. D.U. is a perfect example of this, They wouldn't have done a hell of a lot of what they did this past year if their own selfish interests weren't at stake."
- Man '92

"The ideal social environment would be one in which people are courteous of each other and each other's differences. Where men and women of all racial backgrounds and sexual orientations could live together with a minimum of friction and tension. Where individuals could make choices carefully and have those decisions respected by their fellow students. Essentially, a place where people could learn and have fun without causing others unnecessary amounts of discomfort or annoyance." - Man '90

"A more perfect social environment would involve having a lower 'college' drinking age so as to diversify the social scene more. If the drinking age were lowered, at least when involved in college events, it would allow people to feel more accepted at college events and would also lower in-room drinking. It too would lower the importance of the frats on the social scene; this would allow for a more diversified social scene so that people could go where he wanted to socialize on weekends. It would not be a frat or nothing question." - Man '91

"Until such time that the college can make the student center a reality they should provide an avenue with an atmosphere similar to student centers observed in other colleges where people can meet, relax, etc... Opportunities should be made regarding co-ed special interest clubs which will also help people get to know one another better or meet people with the same interests." - Woman '91

"In an institution where drinking is such a strong part of student social life it would be less pressuring and more comfortable if one could still feel part of the crowd if one doesn't drink. Sometimes if you don't drink, you're not drawn into the social gatherings as much. The fraternities are not really my idea of fun. They gather not for the sake of having a party but for the sake of drinking. Once the kegs are finished so is the party. There should be other get-togethers (and there are some) where drinking is not the element that draws people." - Woman '90

"Whether it is true or not, the lack of fraternities at Middlebury College will make prospective students think that Middlebury social life is lacking." - Man '92

"Chuck the frats and let the college pick up the slack." - Man '90

"Coed residential units/clubs (essentially coed frats without any affiliation) could be established in existing houses (Jewett, Porter...). The units/clubs would provide entertainment very similar to the frats. The frats then would likely decline in membership. The possible future elimination of frats would thus have limited social effects on the Middlebury community in general." - Man '92

"Make more theme houses and make 4 class dorms so freshmen aren't all together. This school is small enough that you can meet a lot of people and eventually a lot of people in your class." - Man '91

"Fraternities and student groups (i.e. MCAB) working together to sponsor activities on campus and at fraternities. An area like the Undergraduate with a dance floor and D.J. a few times a week (Weds. night, Sat. night) add alcohol served so that all classes can interact." - Woman '89

"I don't think it is the existence of frats which is the problem. The true problem lies within the attitudes of the students. The students are simply too oriented around alcohol and other drugs. It seems that no matter what alternative might be offered, the students will reject it if alcohol is not a part of it. I don't know what can be dome about this attitude which seems to be passed down from class to class (generation to generation?). Direct force only seems to make the problem grow. I'm sorry I can't help, but killing the frats won't change the atmosphere for the better, it will simply force parties into dorms or at dangerous driving distances from campus (D.W.I.)." - Woman '92

APPENDIX G

CONFIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Task Force on Student Social Life

FROM: Ann Craig Hanson
Jim Terhune

RE: Comments Written on Parent/Alumni Surveys

DATE: August 29, 1989

More than one hundred of the parents and alumni who participated in the survey chose to write additional comments about various aspects of student social life. We have read and reviewed all of these comments. What follows is an overview of the most frequently raised topics.

The vast majority of comments made were in regards to the fraternity question. However, unlike the unsolicited letters which almost unanimously supported maintaining the fraternity system, there was a much more even distribution of comments on both sides of the issue. It is estimated that 60% of those people who submitted comments on fraternities supported maintaining fraternities and 40% supported abolishing fraternities.

Of those in favor of keeping fraternities, many advocated making them co-ed. Many others argued that sororities should be reestablished. Most felt that the fraternities should be allowed to maintain national affiliations. The vast majority stated that they should be able to continue to use Greek letters and use the term "fraternity".

There was sentiment stating that the "Administration" is out to get fraternities and should focus its energies elsewhere. Many stated that the College should not use fraternities as a scapegoat for societal problems (ie.. alcohol/substance abuse, racism, sexism). They were also quick to point out that abolishing fraternities would not rid Middlebury of these problems.

Most of the people advocating keeping the fraternities sighted the lack of any other viable social alternative as the primary reason. Both parents and alumni believe that a student center is needed.

In Support of Fraternities

Here is a sampling of comments made by those in favor of supporting fraternities:

"In order to obtain this social education, students must be allowed the freedoms to make mistakes - just as they are allowed to make mistakes in the classroom. As a society that makes alcohol a focal point of many activities - a college catering to young adults must be ready for those students to make mistakes with alcohol. These mistakes will be made regardless of the presence or form of fraternities." - Alumni 1980-Present

"Fraternities are social clubs - people enjoying each other. Giving them a name is no big deal. Racism, sexism, elitism, are not caused by fraternities - they pre-exist that institution and abolishing fraternities will not abolish bigotry in any form. National allegiances, however, are ridiculous - I had as much in common with a brother in Alabama as I did with a grape. Middlebury fraternities should be local social clubs." - Alumni - 1950-1959

"I am frankly outraged that the College continues to meddle with fraternities, 20 years since I first watched ill-conceived efforts like the SDU's drain important resources from the business of the College - which I believe to be - education. That includes preparation for the real world, and fraternities serve a valid social and educational function which complements the College's endeavors. Why this asinine witch hunt continues, seeking to purge the campus of any heterogeneity in the spirit and style - foundations of individual thinking - continues to mystify me..... If the College does succeed in eliminating fraternities, I for one will cease any further support." - Alumni 1970-1979

"Fraternities cause a lot of problems. I would say their negative elements outweigh their positive ones at least two to one. But if they are abolished, there will be even less control over the social system. As long as the fraternities exist, there will be groups of people over whom reforms can be legislated. As long as there are fraternities, the number of campus parties will be somewhat limited. If you abolish fraternities, it will be harder to keep things under control. At least with fraternities you know where to send security!" - Alumni 1980-Present

"Here is an interesting proposal: tell the frat presidents that they can keep the fraternities going as long as they do not allow alcohol on the premises." - Alumni 1980-Present

"Because Middlebury is such an isolated community I feel the fraternities are even more important than in a city. I also think it's safer to have the students socializing at fraternities on campus than to be driving to Burlington or New York." - Parent

"I do not believe that the general faculty view that the fraternities should be abolished reflects the general view of the true owners of the school - the alumni." - Alumni - 1980-Present

"With adequate adult supervision fraternities are a very important part of college life. I emphasize the words ADULT SUPERVISION. I believe this may be what Middlebury fraternities are missing." - Parent

"It is becoming apparent to me that Middlebury is catering to intellectual snobs who are unable to cope with their own problems and consequently want to change their own needs or abolish anything that they don't fit in with. I am tired of these snobs using sexism and prejudice as an excuse for their own weaknesses. If the College needs to improve the social and/or intellectual atmosphere for this minority who feels left out, then do it, but don't destroy what has been so positive to so many of us over the years." - Alumni 1965

"Young people have the need and right to be members of selective groups if they so desire, without undue, well intentioned paternalistic intervention from the College.

If the College is short sighted enough, fraternities/sororities, young people of similar personalities, likes, and interests will form groups anyways...

If Middlebury abolishes fraternities/sororities, when it comes to me with palms up, I sadly give Midd thumbs down." - Alumni 1965

"The respect that the fraternities have for the College needs to change. The frats themselves don't and shouldn't. There's nothing wrong with fraternities, there is something wrong with 'holier than thou' attitudes." - Alumni 1980-Present

"When I sent my son to Middlebury, I thought it most important that he join a fraternity, which he did, and the results were excellent.

"Basically a man's success depends on his ability to lead in all male surroundings - business, sports, country clubs, etc. College life can greatly improve his leadership - at an age which is most critical to his growth. Fraternity life will expose him to a wide degree of young men - and he'll learn at a young age just what the world is all about. If you want your son to make it in this world - he must learn the bitter with the sweet, the good and bad, and fraternity life will help him in this goal."

Many things change in this world - but let's make sure our young men can hold their own and make our nation strong and successful." - Alumni 1950-59

"I don't think the college handled the 'D.U. Incident' well at all. In fact I think the college response bordered on the hysterical and I don't think the reporting of the incident by the school was objectively fair or adequate. Young adults make mistakes. Sometimes they make awful mistakes. So do adults. It looks like the school is using the D.U. incident as an excuse or coup de grace to finish fraternities at Middlebury. I feel that is misplaced blame. Students told me that the same mannequin hung outside a dormitory window for days prior to be taken to the D.U. house and nothing was done by the school officials. I don't think banning fraternities makes any sense. Would you bar a dormitory if the same act occurred there?" - Parent

"Fraternities are elitist? In one of the ten toughest schools in the country to get into, what does elitist mean? My Midd years (78-82) would have been nowhere near what they were to me without my fraternity involvement. After graduation, frat functions were what drew me back to Midd for alumni weekends, etc... Kill the frats, and you alienate both students and alums. As a former D.U. member, my yearly contributions to the College now go to the Green Mountain Club in protest of D.U.'s shabby treatment by a few faculty hotheads." - Alumni 1980-Present

"I am thoroughly disgusted to see the college examining the issue of possible abolition of fraternities. They strong armed their way into buying the houses, eliminated the in-house eating programs, homogenizing and pasteurizing the individual fraternity environments and experiences, and now it is still not enough for them. Abolition and acquisition of some more dorm space is all they really want." - Alumni 1970-1979

"Men are men and women are women. It would be ideal that we be equal in every way but we simply are not and too overstress this is negligent academic blindness to very real aspects of everyday life.

We still have both male and female clubs in this state. The biases exist even though they are not overtly practiced. Try to remember that very few women have every played tennis with men at Wimbledon and no men are allowed to compete in the LPGA."
- Alumni 1970-1979

<u>In Support of abolishing fraternities</u>

Of those favoring the abolishment of fraternities, most sighted elitism, sexism, and abuse of alcohol as the primary reasons. Many stated that they themselves had been members of fraternities/sororities but believed that they had outlived their usefulness. Some stated flatly that such organizations had no place at a liberal arts college. A few suggested that Middlebury would do well to follow the example set by Amherst and Williams. A slight majority of the parents of current students seemed to favor abolishing fraternities.

Here is a sampling of comments made by those opposed to fraternities:

"Although I was a fraternity member at Middlebury 57-60, I think there time has come and gone." - Alumni 1960

"I rejected sororities on theoretical grounds, but their utter uselessness might well have inclined me to do so on practical ones. Fraternities at least offered some occasionally amusing parties, though apart from that, and the pleasures people get from in-grouping, they had nothing whatsoever to recommend them." - Alumni 1940-1949

"Unfortunately and repeatedly, students do leave Midd because they can't find others who thirst for knowledge as much as they thirst for beer...

...The Club Midd image is not one that everyone is proud of, nor one that everyone seeks. There is a significant number of students who want to wrestle with ideas and dig below the surface of issues throughout their experience at Midd, not just when they are being graded for it." - Alumni 1970-1979

"...the primitive behavior of the members, including but not limited to the systematic degradation and abuse of women, minorities, homosexuals, non-macho males - in short, of anyone not just like the fraternity members themselves. Now some may enjoy this kind of retrograde simian behavior, and in civil society as private citizens they are at liberty to comport themselves as they see fit. But to my mind fraternities contain, not necessarily, perhaps, but with astounding regularity nonetheless, the distilled essence of what our society desperately needs to rid itself of, namely hostility towards those different from oneself. As such, fraternities are precisely the kind of groupings which a liberal institution such as Middlebury, which devotes itself to understanding and tolerance, would be far better off without." - Alumni 1980 - Present

"The frats do not in my opinion provide any positive services to the College or community... Frats promote elitism (real and imagined) and the exclusion of some members of the College community on a wide spectrum of artificial criteria." - Parent

"I am strongly against fraternities and sororities on any campus, particularly because obviously they encourage and promote drinking by young people.

At the University of California campus where I work, there have been six deaths and one boy paralyzed in the last month - all fraternity/sorority party related and all drunken accidents." - Parent

"Women were not always treated with respect - in fact, we were often treated as 'objects', 'toys' and 'the entertainment'. Again, this attitude was not prevalent in all of the male members of the fraternity, but it would be fair to say that it was shared by the majority.

I also have distinct memories of many male students deriding homosexuals, threatening women half-seriously and half-jokingly with 'trains' (a euphemism for gang-rape), priding themselves on their 'trophy' collections (again, another euphemism for articles of female clothing which served as proof of their 'conquest'), and destroying property. At the time many of us went along or kept silent, but in looking back, I find this behavior cruel and misguided." - Alumni 1978 (Fraternity Social Member)

"The fraternities have outlived their usefulness. They promote elitism, are clannish and clique oriented. I was a fraternity member for my four years of college - I enjoyed it at the time, but in reflection I believe my college experience could have been greatly enhanced in a fraternity free environment." - Alumni 1950-59

"The question that Middlebury College must ask itself is: 'Is the fraternity system the best and only means of providing an answer to the numerous demands of undergraduate life?'

I believe the answer is no. In the early 1980's, fraternities (before the drinking age) had to compete with numerous other social entities: downtown, language houses, off campus parties, etc. At that point in time, fraternities were an arguable asset at Middlebury, but now with the advent of the drinking age requirements, the options are limited and the fraternities are overburdened.

Middlebury is a small school with one of the most socially adept student bodies in America. It certainly does not need fraternities to provide the social life for the student body. Let Middlebury reflect the social life of the real world without imposing a structure on a student's life." - Alumni 1980 - Present

"Then and today, it has seemed to me that a college the size and constitution of Middlebury has no need of sororities or fraternities. The same social and interest ends can be met through open clubs and organizations. That sororities/fraternities provide partying places and serve as ego-identity boosters does not serve the college or the students well." - Alumni 1940-1949

"Fraternities do nothing but discriminate against people who would like that type of housing without having to go through some sick humiliating initiation rights, or just drinking till you throw up. They're totally outmoded and provide no positive input to the College as a whole. Get with the times - fraternities, like the Ku Klux Klan, are vestiges of a time we'd be better off leaving behind." - Alumni 1980-Present

"In my opinion, fraternities have no place in the college or university of today. The world is marvelously huge, complex and fascinating largely because of the diversity of its cultures, customs and peoples, all of whom should be the concern of every one of us. While fraternities may have served a useful purpose several generations ago, at this time they play a devisive role erecting unnecessary barriers and isolating groups of students from exposure to people unlike themselves. They are by nature exclusionary and by labeling individual members those students are pressured to fit a stereotypical image. Behavior which seems unacceptable to the individual student when acting alone becomes acceptable when he is a part of the group. Alcohol overconsumption and male (macho) chauvinism appear to go hand in hand as part of the fraternity system. The stress caused by peer pressure within the fraternity combines with the stress of the 'difficult' student who is rejected by it and the stress upon the individual without financial means to join; the result is further tension on the campus and further stress on the individual student at an already stressful time of life." - Alumni 1940-1949

Comments on other apsects of Student Life

Although most of the people who chose to add written comments to their survey responses focused on the fraternity question, many other topics were raised. Here is a sampling of comments made on subjects other than fraternities:

"In our opinion, the problem in colleges today is not fraternities, but standards of behavior. Fraternities are convenient to bash, but the social ills won't be solved by blaming them.

We seem to have extended adolescence from a few teen years into a decade (12-22) of mindless me-ism. Yes, we parents are mostly to be blames, but maybe we all could be inspired and instructed by the stance of our colleges and universities.

Why can't we retreat from the sixties rebellion and once again have rules - starting with the dorms and extending into the fraternities - rules for cleanliness, noise, civilized behavior, respect for property? Can't we have an adult resident in each housing unit? Could there be some "formal" social events - teas, receptions, etc. at least equal to the number of permitted beer brawls? Some colleges dare require attendance at a certain number of cultural events. Even a few dress up dinners.

In defense of parents, some of us do require considerate behavior, but end up as old fogies because the world outside seems to have little continuity of standards." - Parent

"Going to college is an opportunity for young adults to grow. While I understand that there are problems on campus (and I am shocked at the nature of some of them), I do not believe that increasing supervision is the answer. The mistakes which students make should be dealt with by the student, higher peers, and the Administration when necessary. But imposing stricter restraints on the whole campus would detract from the atmosphere which is distinctly Middlebury's, and which included a trusty open campus." - Parent

"Although fraternities are not apriori despicable, it is empirically true that fraternities are despicable. That is, it is possible that fraternities are not populated by despicable people engaging in despicable behavior (which, by the way, is the point of a fraternity). However, this is not the case.

I should add that Middelbury is comparatively nondespicable as regards fraternities. Dartmouth is much more despicable, for instance. But this is just to say something akin to "Mussolini was not as evil as Hitler." - Alumni 1980-Present

"I chose my own undergraduate schools in part because they did not have fraternities/sororities. One of my 3 children chose a college (Oberlin) which does not have fraternities, two chose colleges which do (U.Va in addition to Middlebury) and the U. of Virginia son belonged to a fraternity. My observation leads me to conclude that the fraternity experience was not a positive one in terms of maturation. It encouraged my son to remain an uncivilized yahoo longer than he otherwise would have, reinforced negative and predatory attitude toward women, and perpetrated irresponsible use of alcohol. Nothing I have observed of my daughter's experience at Middlebury, most especially the deplorable incident at Delta Upsilon, has mitigated the force of my U. of Virginia based conclusion. Fraternities are inherently elitist and sexist, and in practice are often racist, anti-semitic and homophobic. As against these major social debits, it seems to me a lame apologia to urge the value of male bonding and peer-group solidarity for late adolescent males. These organization are, in my view, institutions devoid of any redeeming social value. To suggest that the (arguably largely cosmetic) social service contribution fraternities may make to the community mitigates the harm they do is specious." - Parent

"I approach this questionnaire from the position of both a recent graduate and an instructor at Columbia University. From both points of view I can see nothing positive about the fraternity system. Students who wish to live in groups are able to anyway. Why not turn the frat houses into "special interest" houses like the language dorms? Fraternities at both Columbia and Middlebury seem to be involved in a rising number of racial and sexist "incidents", often attributed to "high spirits" or excused with sentiments such as "boys will be boys," but should these incidents be excused? Aren't the fraternities to blame for bringing the perpetrators together in an environment where such behavior is considered acceptable? Middlebury has always seemed to support racial and gender equality and to strive for a non-elitist approach - Don't fraternities, which choose their numbers by "elitist" qualifications and are nationally permitted to discriminate by race and sex go against those desires?" - Alumni 1980-Present

"The Middlebury phone system does not allow students and parents to take advantage of credit card calls. Using a credit card number is much more convenient and also offers a substantial savings over regular long distance rates. The current Middlebury College phone system should be modified to allow students to make credit card calls. As a last resort, if these modifications would be extremely difficult and expensive, I suggest that pay phones should be more accessible to students." - Parent

An overwhelming number of respondents commented on how highly they regarded Middlebury academically.

Many people expressed an interest in the status of the Student Center project.

A few older alumni stated that since their children had not been accepted at Middlebury they were no longer interested in the College.

One recent alumnus stated that "academics should be stressed, but this should not be at the expense of athletics."

Many older alumni stated that they had been out of touch with the college for so long that they were unqualified to comment on the current state of the college.

Some criticized the survey as either was biased against fraternities or confusing. Contrarily, many respondents thanked the Task Force for the opportunity to present their opinions.

APPENDIX H
TASK FORCE ON STUDENT LIFE
A MINORITY REPORT ON THE FRATERNITY SYSTEM

We, the Task Force members who represent the minority opinion, believe that it is possible, in fact desirable, to begin with the existing fraternity structure and gradually to develop a new social system. We feel that the most positive course of action is to use the present membership of fraternities as the nucleus of this new social system. We recognize that the fraternities have already begun to institute needed internal reforms and believe that with help from the community, these organizations will continue to change until they are fully coeducational social/residential groups which serve the needs of our students and the goals of our college.

Recognizing that the fraternity issue directly affects the students themselves and decidedly impacts on their social life, we feel that student opinion on this matter should carry substantial importance. In the student survey conducted by the committee, we found that a substantial majority of students favor retention of the fraternity system even when the presumably favorable vote of fraternity members is discounted. In addition, the sentiment expressed by the Student Government Association overwhelmingly supported (36 to 6) retention of the fraternity system with reforms.

A minority of Task Force members suggests the following recommendations:

That fraternities be maintained, but a social reconstruction occur, one which brings these organizations into harmony with our changing society and the goals of our College.

We recommend the following:

1) Full and equal participation of women.

Rationale: All male organizations are antithetical to the mission of the college and not appropriate as a model for the society at large. Fraternities are committed to abide by the "open-rush" premises now stipulated within the Document of Understanding which provides that any member of the college community is eligible to join any fraternity.

2) Disassociation from nationals.

Rationale: Little is to be gained by perpetuating national ties if nationals do not accept women as full and equal members. Thus, disassociation from nationals is an inevitable consequence of admitting women members. If, however, a local chapter can prove

itself a catalyst for changing national policies, then national affiliations may be retained. Failure to comply with this recommendation will demand that the fraternity disband entirely as a College organization.

3) Greater outside involvement in the development and operation of these coeducational residential/social units.

Rationale: Presently, fraternities have little outside influence. Adult presence and judgment could add strength to any system. We recommend greater outside involvement by both men and women faculty members, advisers, overseers or advisory boards. The absence of such dialogue has been a source of misunderstanding and unnecesary tensions in the past.

4) Establishment of a committee which reports to the Community Council, to assist in planning and implementing this reconstruction.

Rationale: Through the changes that fraternities have undertaken during the past two years, the members have learned how difficult it is to make radical changes of direction and attitude. They know that the transitions which all come from a major social reconstruction will take time and will necessitate careful planning by and support from all segments of our community. Board-based support will insure that the new system serves the entire student community.

5) A staff member who reports to the Director of Residential Life should be assigned primary responsibility to oversee compliance and implementation of changes made during the reconstruction.

Rationale: It is reasonable to assume that the task of major reconstruction of a system will necessitate the presence of a staff member who is in charge of overseeing the day-to-day functioning of these groups.

6) Students will be eligible to join these residential/social groups at the beginning of their sophomore year and subsequently during their college careers. All formal and planned activities regarding membership must not be initiated prior to that time.

Rationale: Students need more time to become part of the greater community before they splinter off into separate groups.

7) A new Document of Understanding needs to be written to reflect a new social/residential structure.

Rationale: Campus life has changed during the past ten years.

Any guidelines which govern a social system must reflect current rules and legal restrictions.

Controversy surrounds fraternities as they presently exist. Nationally and locally, they have provided many opportunities for negative publicity while their good deeds and merits often go unnoticed. For example, although some charge that fraternity members are anti-intellectual, grade point averages achieved by fraternity members are identical to those of all Middlebury College students. They also contribute to our community through service and social activities. There are very few places where social life is as attractive, and while a Student Center will be a big help, it will not meet the social needs of all students and it is not in place at this time. There will always be a need for supplemental units to provide social experiences for our diverse community.

The members of both the majority of minority opinions agree on the kind of coeducational social systems which would better meet the needs of students. Mainly, we differ on the way to achieve that goal. The minority group prefers using the existing system as the vehicle for changes in the social/residential structure. We also feel that to eliminate the present system without something to replace it immediately would not be in the best interest of the community.

The present fraternity system has served the College for many years. It has its critics and its supporters. Both have expressed legitimate concerns and called for reforms. We believe that reforms can occur and that they will eventually provide a coeducational social/residential system which will serve our students well.

This recommendation is supported by: Patrick Alymer, John DeMatte, Frank Kelley, Kyle Prescott, and Ali Wilson.

Absentitions: Judge Albert Coffrin

Opposed: Peter Chenevert, Francesca Fontes, Ann Craig Hanson, Beth Ladimer, Margaret Lynch, Pat Palmer, Steven Rockefeller, John Spencer, Pamela Small, Gail Smith, Rich Wolfson.